

CITY OF GUADALUPE



2023 – 2031 Housing Element

Revised Draft Update

**Submitted by the City of Guadalupe
2/6/2025**

Prepared by:
De Lapide & Associates, Inc.
delapide@outlook.com

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the City Council, the City Staff, and stakeholders of the City of Guadalupe for their assistance in preparation of this Housing Element. We would like to acknowledge the following officials:

City Council

Ariston Julian, Mayor

Eugene Costa Jr., Mayor Pro Tem

Christina Hernandez, Council member

Gilbert Robles, Council member

Megan Lizalde, Council member

Anna Marie Santillan Michaud, City Treasurer (Elected Official)

Amelia M Villegas, City Clerk (Elected Official)

Staff

Todd Bodem, City Administrator

Larry Appel, Planning Director

Chief Michael Cash, Public Safety Department

Shannon Sweeny, Public Works Director/City Engineer

Lorena Zarate, Finance Director

Juana Escobar, Administrative Assistant

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	ii
City Council	ii
Staff	ii
List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	x
City Council Resolution	xi
Housing Element Update Guidance	xiii
Attachment: Completeness Checklist	xiii
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Community Context	1
1.2 Public Participation	2
1.2.1 Consolidated Outreach Activities	2
1.2.2 Special 6 th Cycle Outreach Findings	3
1.2.3 Inclusion of Outreach Findings in Housing Element	5
1.2.4 Expansion of Future Outreach	5
1.3 Consistency with Other Elements of the General Plan	6
1.4 Organization of the Element	6
2.0 Housing Needs Assessment.....	8
2.1. Population Characteristics	8
2.1.1 Population Growth Trends	8
2.1.2 Age	8
2.1.3 Race and Ethnicity	9
2.1.4 Conclusion	10
2.2 Employment Trends	10
2.2.1 Current Employment	10
2.2.2 Projected Job Growth	12
2.2.3 Jobs-Housing Balance	12
2.2.4 Conclusion	13
2.3 Household Characteristics	14
2.3.1 Growth in Households	14
2.3.2 Household Composition and Size	14
2.3.3 Household Income.....	15
2.3.4 Conclusion	17
2.4 Characteristics of the Housing Stock	17
2.4.1 Housing Types and Growth.....	17
2.4.2 Housing Age and Conditions.....	18

2.4.3 Housing Tenure	20
2.4.4 Vacancy.....	20
2.4.5 Housing Cost.....	21
2.4.6 Affordability and Overpayment	23
2.4.7 Overcrowding	24
2.4.8 Conclusion	25
2.5 Special Housing Needs	25
2.5.1 Elderly.....	25
2.5.2 Large Households	27
2.5.3 Female Headed Households	28
2.5.4 Persons with Disabilities	30
2.5.5 Farmworkers.....	32
2.5.6 Unhoused	34
2.5.7 Extremely Low-Income Households	35
2.5.8 Persons with Developmental Disabilities	35
2.6 Assisted Housing At-Risk of Conversion	36
2.6.1 Inventory of Potential At-Risk Units	37
2.6.2 Risk of Conversion	37
2.7 Future Growth Needs.....	39
2.7.1 Overview of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation.....	39
3.0 Resources for Residential Development	41
3.01 Introduction	41
3.02 State Requirements for the Site Inventory	41
3.02.1 Default Densities	41
3.02.2 Realistic Capacity.....	42
3.02.3 Carry-Over Sites	42
3.02.4 Special Requirements for Sites Designated to meet Lower-Income Needs	43
3.02.5 Non-Vacant Sites and the “Substantial Evidence” Requirement.....	43
3.02.6 Reporting of Sites by Income Category	44
3.02.7 Buffer and No Net Loss Requirements	44
3.02.8 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Requirements.....	44
3.02.9 SB 9 Lot Split and Duplex Requirements	45
3.03 Evidence to Support Estimates of Realistic Capacity of Parcels	45
3.1 Land Availability	46
3.1.1 Vacant Residential Parcels.....	47
3.1.2 Mixed Use Development	49
3.1.3 DJ Farms Specific Plan Area	49

3.2 Financial Resources	50
3.2.1 Federal and State Resources	50
3.2.2 Local Resources	54
4.0 Constraints	56
4.1 Governmental Constraints	56
4.1.0 Transparency of Zoning, Development Standards, and Fees.....	56
4.1.1 Land Use Controls.....	56
4.1.2 Residential Development Processing and Permit Procedures	67
4.1.3 Development Fees	74
4.1.4 Regional Constraints.....	75
4.1.5 Accessory Dwelling Units.....	76
4.2 Non-Governmental Constraints	77
4.2.1 Fiscal Constraints.....	78
4.2.2 Citizen Behavior	79
4.2.3 Environmental Constraints	80
4.2.4 Infrastructure and Public Facilities	83
4.2.5 Short-Term Rentals (STRs)	84
5.0 Energy Conservation Opportunities	85
5.1 Planning and land Use	85
5.2 Energy Efficient Practices and Technologies	86
6.0 Housing Action Plan	88
6.1 Affordable Housing Supply	88
6.2 Conservation and Rehabilitation	92
6.3 At-Risk Units	92
6.4 Special Needs	94
6.5 Energy Conservation	96
6.6 Equal Opportunity Housing	98
6.7 Quantified Objectives	102
6.8 Furthering Fair Housing	103
6.8.1 Contributing Factors	103
6.8.2 Implementation Actions to Further Fair Housing	104
7.0 Appendices.....	119
7.1 Appendix A: Evaluation of 2015 Housing Element	119
7.1.1 Program Evaluation	119
7.1.2 Appropriateness of Goals and Policies	119
7.1.3. Progress in Meeting Quantified Objectives	119
7.1.4. Progress toward Special Needs Populations.....	120
7.1.5. Shortfall of Sites from the 5 th Cycle Planning Period	120

7.2 Appendix B: Residential Land Inventory	141
7.2.0 Site Analysis for 6 th Cycle RHNA.....	141
7.2.1 Vacant Land	144
7.2.2 Mixed-Use Development.....	149
7.2.3 DJ Farms Specific Plan	154
7.2.4 Small and Large Sites & Suitability of Nonvacant Sites	154
7.2.5 People’s Self-Help Housing Project.....	154
7.2.6 Opportunities for Emergency Shelters	154
7.2.7 Conclusions on Inventory of Residential Opportunities	155
7.3 Appendix C: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.....	156
7.3.0 Legislative Basis for Fair Housing.....	156
7.3.1 Fair Housing Outreach & Enforcement	156
7.3.2 Assessment of Fair Housing	164
7.3.3 Sites Inventory	207
7.3.4 Identification of Contributing Factors	209
7.3.5 Goals and Actions.....	211
7.3.6 Local Data and Knowledge	211
7.4 Appendix D: Development Fees.....	213
8.0 References.....	215

List of Tables

Table 2-1: Population Growth Trends. Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2000 – 2020.....	8
Table 2-2: Age Distribution - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020.....	9
Table 2-3: Population by Race/Ethnicity - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020	9
Table 2-4: Labor Force and Employment Rates - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020.....	10
Table 2-5: Distribution of Employment by Occupation and Median Earning – Guadalupe City, 2020	11
Table 2-6: Protected Job Growth by Occupation from 2018 to 2028 – Santa Maria & Santa Barbara Metropolitan Statistical Area	12
Table 2-7: Jobs to Housing Ratio - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020	13
Table 2-8: Household Growth Trends - Guadalupe City, 2000 to 2020	14
Table 2-9: Household Composition - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020	15
Table 2-10: Distribution of Household Sizes - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020.....	15
Table 2-11: Household Income - Guadalupe City, 2020.....	16
Table 2-12: Comparative Median Household Incomes - Santa Barbara County and Cities, 2020	16
Table 2-13: Median Income Distribution of Household Income Groups - Guadalupe City, 2020.....	17
Table 2-14: Housing Unit Type- Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020	18
Table 2-15: Age Distribution and Growth of Housing Stock - Guadalupe City, 2020	18
Table 2-16: Trends in Housing Conditions - Guadalupe 2008 to 2017	20
Table 2-17: Trends in Housing Tenure of Occupied Units - Guadalupe, 2000 to 2020	20
Table 2-18: Comparative Median Home Values - Santa Barbara County and Cities, 2000 to 2020.....	22
Table 2-19: Distribution of Contract Rent Payments - Guadalupe City, 2020.....	23
Table 2-20: Percent of Household Income Spent on Housing – Guadalupe City, 2020	24
Table 2-21: Overcrowding - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020	25
Table 2-22: Households by Age of Householder - Guadalupe City, 2000 to 2020	26
Table 2-23: Householder by Tenure and Age - Guadalupe City, 2020	26
Table 2-24: Number of Rooms per Occupied Housing Unit by Tenure – Guadalupe City, 2020.....	28
Table 2-25: Number of Persons per Occupied Housing Unit by Tenure - Guadalupe City, 2020.....	28
Table 2-26: Occupied Housing Units by Household Type by Tenure - Guadalupe City, 2020.....	29
Table 2-27: Comparative Characteristics of Householders - Guadalupe City, 2020	30
Table 2-28: Population with Disability - Guadalupe City, 2020.....	31
Table 2-29: Top 10 Agriculture Products by Rank - Santa Barbara County, 2018 and 2020	33
Table 2-30: Estimates of Farmworker Population - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020.....	34
Table 2-31: Distribution of Persons with Developmental Disabilities – Guadalupe, 2021.....	36
Table 2-32: Inventory of Assisted Affordable Housing Developments - Guadalupe City, 2020.....	37

Table 2-32: Shares of Households vs. RHNA Allocations by Income Groups - Guadalupe City, 2020.....	40
Table 3-1: Capacity of Vacant Residential Land Exclusive of DJ Farms Specific Plan Area	48
Table 3-2: Housing Capacity of DJ Farms Specific Plan Area	49
Table 3-3: Additional Federal, State, and Private Financial Resources	50
Table 4-1: Guadalupe General Plan Residential Land Use Designations.....	57
Table 4-2: Residential & Commercial Zoning in Guadalupe	58
Table 4-3: Development Standards in Guadalupe Zoning Code	59
Table 4-4: Allowed Residential Development by Zone	59
Table 4-5: Parking Space & Street Width Standards	64
Table 4-6: Typical Permit Processing Time Requirements	70
Table 4-7: Fees that Affect Housing Production	75
Table 4-8: Sewer Capacity and Projected Sewer Demand	83
Table 6-1: Comparison of RHNA Allocations Met and Unmet by Income Groups in Guadalupe	103
Table 6-2: Quantified Housing Need in Guadalupe for 2023-2031 Cycle	103
Table 6-3: AFFH Action Matrix for 2023-2031.....	105
Table A-1: Evaluation of Programs in 2015 Housing Element - City of Guadalupe	121
Table A-2: Appropriateness of 2015 Guadalupe Housing Element Goals and Policies	131
Table A-3a. Progress in Achieving Quantified Objectives (All Incomes)	135
Table A-3b. Progress in Achieving Quantified Objectives (Lower Incomes) – Completed Apartments	135
Table A-3c. Progress in Achieving Quantified Objectives (Lower Incomes) – Completed ADUs.....	135
Table A-4a: Residential Permit Activities - City of Guadalupe, 2015 through 2021.....	136
Table A-4b: Recent Residential Permit Activities by Income - City of Guadalupe, 2019-2021	137
Table A-4c: Recent Activities on ADUs - City of Guadalupe, Nov. 2019 to Nov. 2023	138
Table A-5: Affordability of Residential Construction - City of Guadalupe, Late 2015 to Early 2019	138
Table B-2: Inventory of Vacant Residential Infill Sites in Guadalupe from Land Use Inventory	145
Table B-3: Other Vacant Residential Land within Built-Up Area	148
Table B-4. Mixed-Use Development Potential	150
Table B-5: Other Lots with Mixed-Use Potential.....	153
Table B-6: Full Housing Capacity at DJ Farms Specific Plan Area	154
Table B-7: Summary of Potential for Housing Development in Guadalupe Including 6th Cycle.....	155
Table C-1: Number of Fair Housing Enforcement Cases in Counties near Guadalupe, 2010 and 2020	159
Table C-2: Population by Race/Ethnicity - Guadalupe City & Region, 2021	165
Table C-3: Population by Race/Ethnicity - Guadalupe City & Region, 2010	165
Table C-4: Incidence of Disability in the Guadalupe Region, 2019.....	171
Table C-5: Distribution of Household/Family Types in the Guadalupe Region, 2010	174
Table C-6: Distribution of Household/Family Types in the Guadalupe Region, 2019	175

Table C-7: 2010 and 2020 Median Incomes and Poverty Levels in the Guadalupe Region	176
Table C-8: Comparative opportunity Indices for School Proficiency in the Guadalupe Region, 2020	196
Table C-9: HUD Opportunity Indicators in Santa Barbara County, 2010.....	197
Table C-10: Labor Force and Employment Rates - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020.....	198
Table C-11: Distribution of Employment by Occupation (2021) and Median Earning (2020).....	199
Table C-12. Progress in Achieving Quantified Objectives (All Incomes) in 2015-2023 Housing Element	206
Table D-1: Consolidated List of Fees in Guadalupe	213

List of Figures

Figure 2-1: Age Distribution of Housing Stock - Guadalupe City, 2020	19
Figure 2-2: Median Household Income vs. Median Home Value – Guadalupe City, 2000-2020	22
Figure 4-1: Environmental Constraints Map–Prime Agricultural Lands under Williamson Act Contract.....	81
Figure 4-2: Environmental Constraints Map–Floodable Areas.....	82
Figure 4-3: Environmental Constraints Map–Wetlands and Habitat Areas	82
Figure A-1 DJ Farms Site Map	139
Figure A-2: Peoples’ Self-Help Housing Breaks Ground on New Affordable Housing in Guadalupe, CA	140
Figure B-1: Locations of Pipeline Projects and Potential Lot Consolidations in 6 th Cycle.....	142
Figure B-2: Opportunities for Housing at Vacant Infill, Mix-Use, and DJ Farms Sites	147
Figure C-1: Distribution of Fair Housing Enforcement Cases in Guadalupe & Region, 2010.....	162
Figure C-2: Distribution of Fair Housing Enforcement Cases in Guadalupe & Region, 2020.....	163
Figure C-3: 2020 Neighborhood Designations within the City of Guadalupe.....	167
Figure C-4: 2010 Concentrations of Hispanic Population by Census Block in Guadalupe Neighborhoods	169
Figure C-5: 2020 Concentrations of Hispanic Population by Census Block in Guadalupe and its Region	170
Figure C-6: 2014 Concentrations of Disability Populations in Guadalupe and its Region	172
Figure C-7: 2019 Concentrations of Disability Populations in Guadalupe and its Region	173
Figure C-8: Percent of Home Owners Paying >30% of Incomes on Housing, Guadalupe Region, 2014	177
Figure C-9: Percent of Home Owners Paying >30% of Incomes on Housing, Guadalupe Region, 2019	178
Figure C-10: Percent of Renters Paying >30% of Incomes on Housing, Guadalupe Region, 2014	179
Figure C-11: Percent of Renters Paying >30% of Incomes on Housing, Guadalupe Region, 2019	180
Figure C-12: Locations of Subsidized Housing Projects in the Guadalupe Region, 2021.....	182
Figure C-13: Locations of Subsidized Housing Projects within Guadalupe and Vicinity, 2021	183
Figure C-14: Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty in Guadalupe & Region, 2000	185
Figure C-15: Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty in Guadalupe & Region, 2010	186
Figure C-16: Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty in Guadalupe & Region, 2013	187
Figure C-17: Composite Opportunity Areas in Guadalupe & Region, 2020.....	188
Figure C-18: Concentrations of Non-Hispanic Whites in Guadalupe Neighborhoods, 2010.....	192
Figure C-19: Concentrations of Non-Hispanic Whites in Guadalupe Neighborhoods, 2020.....	193
Figure C-20: Levels of Resource Availability in Guadalupe & Region, 2020	195
Figure C-21: Levels of Displacement Risk in Guadalupe & Region, 2019	203
Figure C-22: 2010 to 2021 Trends in Housing Vacancy in Guadalupe and Santa Barbara County	205
Figure C-23: 2022 Incidence of Toxic Release by Census Tract in Guadalupe	210

City Council Resolution

To be added . . .

Housing Element Update Guidance

Attachment: Completeness Checklist



HOUSING ELEMENT COMPLETENESS CHECKLIST

A Quick Reference of Statutory Requirements for Housing Element Updates

Updated 1/2021

The purpose of this completeness checklist is to assist local governments in the preparation of their housing element. It includes the statutory requirements of Government Code section 65580 – 65588. Completion of this checklist is not an indication of statutory compliance but is intended to provide a check to ensure that relevant requirements are included in the housing element prior to submittal to the Department of Housing and Community Development pursuant to Government Code section 65585(b). For purposes of the Checklist the term “analysis” is defined as a description and evaluation of specific needs, characteristics, and resources available to address identified needs.

For technical assistance on each section visit [California Housing and Community Development Building Blocks Technical Assistance](https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/building-blocks/index.shtml) (https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/building-blocks/index.shtml)

Checklist

Public Participation

Government Code section 65583, subdivision (c)(8)

Description of Requirement	Section Number
Description of the diligent efforts the jurisdiction made to include all economic segments of the community and/or their representatives in the development and update of the housing element	1.2
Summary of the public input received and a description of how it will be considered and incorporated into the housing element.	1.2.2

Review and Revise

Government Code section 65588, subdivision (a)

Description of Requirement	Section Number
<u>Progress in implementation</u> – A description of the actual results or outcomes of the previous element’s goals, objectives, policies, and programs (e.g., what happened).	7.1.3 Table A-2 Table A-4
<u>Effectiveness of the element</u> – For each program, include an analysis comparing the differences between what was projected or planned in the element and what was achieved.	7.1.1 Table A-1
<u>Appropriateness of goals, objectives, policies, and programs</u> –A description of how the goals, objectives, policies, and programs in the updated element are being changed or adjusted to incorporate what has been learned from the results of the previous element. (e.g., continued, modified, or deleted.)	7.1.4 Table A-3a,c
<u>Special needs populations</u> – Provide a description of how past programs were effective in addressing the housing needs of the special populations. This analysis can be done as part of describing the effectiveness of the program pursuant to (2) if the jurisdiction has multiple programs to specifically address housing needs of special needs populations or if specific programs were not included, provide a summary of the cumulative results of the programs in addressing the housing need terms of units or services by special need group.	2.5
<u>AB 1233 – Shortfall of sites from the 5th cycle planning period – Failure to implement rezoning required due to a shortfall of adequate sites to accommodate the 5th cycle planning period RHNA for lower-income households triggers the provisions of Government Code section 65584.09.</u>	NA 7.1.5 Table A-3a,b

Comments: Besides, the key pages indicated in this checklist, there are other descriptions and analyses of these topics throughout the document.

Housing Needs Assessment – Quantification and Analysis of Need

Government Code section 65583, subdivision (a)(1)(2) and section 65583.1, subdivision (d)

For information on how to credit reductions to RHNA See “Housing Element Sites Inventory Guidebook” at [HCD’s technical assistance memos](https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/housing-element-memos.shtml) (https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/housing-element-memos.shtml)

Description of Requirement	Section Number
Population (e.g., by age, size, ethnicity, households by tenure) and employment trends	2.1.1-3
Household characteristics including trends, tenure, overcrowdings and severe overcrowding	2.3.1-4 2.4.1-8
Overpayment by income and tenure	2.4.6
Existing housing need for extremely low-income households	2.5.1-8
Projected housing needs: Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) by income group, including projected extremely low-income households	7.2
Housing stock conditions, including housing type, housing costs, vacancy rate	2.4.2-4
Estimate of the number of units in need of replacement and rehabilitation	2.4.2 Table 2-16

Identification and Analysis of the Housing Needs for Special Needs Populations

Government Code section 65583, subdivision (a)(7)

Description of Requirement	Section Number
Elderly	2.5.1
Persons with Disabilities, including Developmental Disabilities	2.5.4,8
Large Households	2.5.2
Farmworkers (seasonal and permanent)	2.5.5
Female Headed Households	2.5.3
Homeless (seasonal and annual based on the point in time count	2.5.6
Optional: Other (e.g., students, military) -- Extremely low-income	2.5.7

Comments:

Commensurate with Housing Needs assessments for Special Needs Populations, there are policies and programs directed at these groups.

Affirmatively Further Fair Housing - An Assessment of Fair Housing – Required for Housing Element due after 1/1/2021.

Government Code section 65583, subdivision (c)(10)(A)

Part 1 Outreach

Description of Requirement	Page Number
Does the element describe and incorporate meaningful engagement that represents all segments of the community into the development of the housing element, including goals and actions?	1.2.1-3

Part 2 Assessment of Fair Housing

Description of Requirement	Section Number
Does the element include a summary of fair housing enforcement and capacity in the jurisdiction?	7.3.1.2
The element must include an analysis of these four areas: Integration and segregation patterns and trends	7.3.2.1
Racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty	7.3.2.2
Disparities in access to opportunity	7.3.2.3
Disproportionate housing needs within the jurisdiction, including displacement risk	7.3.2.4

Each analysis should include these components:

- Local: Review and analysis of data at a local level
- Regional impact; Analysis of local data as it compares on a regional level
- Trends and patterns: Review of data to identify trends and patterns over time
- Other relevant factors, including other local data and knowledge
- Conclusion and findings with a summary of fair housing issues

Part 3 Sites Inventory

Description of Requirement	Section Number
Did the element identify and evaluate (e.g., maps) the number of units, location and assumed affordability of identified sites throughout the community (i.e., lower, moderate, and above moderate income RHNA) relative to all components of the assessment of fair housing?	7.3.3
Did the element analyze and conclude whether the identified sites improve or exacerbate conditions for each of the fair housing areas (integration and segregation, racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty, areas of opportunity, disproportionate housing needs including displacement)?	7.3.3

Comments: Appendix B has additional details on residential land inventory. It includes table and maps of actual sites on pages 81 through 92

Part 4 Identification of Contributing Factors

Description of Requirement	Section Number
Did the element identify, evaluate, and prioritize the contributing factors to fair housing issues?	7.3.4

Part 5 Goals and Actions Page

Description of Requirement	Section Number
Did the element identify, goals and actions based on the identified and prioritized contributing factors?	7.3.5 Table 6-3
Do goals and actions address mobility enhancement, new housing choices and affordability in high opportunity areas, place-based strategies for preservation and revitalization, displacement protection and other program areas?	Table 6-3

Programs must include the following components:

Actions must be significant, meaningful and sufficient to overcome identified patterns of segregation and affirmatively further fair housing.

Metrics and milestones for evaluating progress on programs/actions and fair housing results.

Affordable Housing Units At-Risk of Conversion to Market Rate

Government Code section 65583, subdivision (a)(9)

See [Preserving Existing Affordable Housing](https://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/preserving-existing-affordable-housing.shtml) (https://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/preserving-existing-affordable-housing.shtml)

Description of Requirement	Section Number
Provide an inventory of units at-risk of conversion from affordable to market-rate rents within 10 years of the beginning of the planning period. The inventory must list each development by project name and address, the type of governmental assistance received, the earliest possible date of change from low-income use, and the total number of elderly and nonelderly units that could be lost from the locality’s low-income housing stock in each year.	2.6.1-2 Table 2-32
Provide an estimate and comparison of replacement costs vs. preservation costs	2.4.2
Identify qualified entities to acquire and manage affordable housing	7.2.5
Identify potential funding sources to preserve affordable housing	3.2.1-2

Comments: According to the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority and City data, 7 percent or 18 of the 272 assisted units in the City could be at risk of converting to market rate in 2030, near the end of the 2023-2031 time period.

Analysis of Actual and Potential Governmental Constraints

Government Code section, 65583, subdivisions (a)(5), (a)(4), (c)(1), and section 65583.2, subdivision (c)
 See “Accessory Dwelling Unit Handbook” at [HCD’s Accessory Dwelling Unit Assistance page](https://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/accessorydwellingunits.shtml)
 (https://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/accessorydwellingunits.shtml)

Description of Requirement	Section Number
Land use controls (e.g. parking, lot coverage, heights, unit size requirements, open space requirements, Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) requirements, floor area ratios, growth controls (e.g., caps on units or population or voter approval requirements, conformance with the requirements of SB 330), inclusionary requirements, consistency with State Density Bonus Law and Housing Accountability Act, and consistency with zoning and development standard website publication and transparency requirements pursuant to Gov. Code § 65940.1 subd. (a)(1)(B)).	4.1.1
Local processing and permit procedures (e.g., typical processing times, permit types/requirements by housing type and zone, decision making criteria/findings, design/site/architectural review process and findings, description of standards [objective/subjective], planned development process). Element should also describe whether the jurisdiction has a process to accommodate SB 35 streamline applications and by-right applications for permanent supportive housing and navigation centers.	4.1.2
Building codes and their enforcement (e.g., current application of the California Building Code, any local amendments, and local code enforcement process and programs)	4.1.1.5.1
On and Off-Site improvement requirements (e.g., street widths, curbing requirements)	4.1.3.2
Fees and other exactions (e.g., list all fees regardless of entity collecting the fee, analyze all planning and impact fees for both single family and multifamily development, provided typical totals and proration to total development costs per square foot, and consistency with fee website publication and transparency requirements pursuant to Gov. Code § 65940.1 subd. (a)(1)(A)).	4.1.3.1 Table 4-8
Housing for persons with disabilities (e.g., definition of family, concentrating/siting requirements for group homes, reasonable accommodation procedures, application of building codes and ADA requirements, zoning for group homes and community care facilities)	4.1.1.3.5 4.1.2.5 4.2
Analysis of locally-adopted ordinances that directly impact the cost and supply of housing (e.g., inclusionary ordinance, short-term rental ordinance)	4.2.5

Comments:

An Analysis of Potential and Actual Nongovernmental Constraints

Government Code section, 65583, subdivision (a)(6)

Description of Requirement	Section Number
Availability of financing	4.2.1.1
Price of land	4.2.1.2
Cost of Construction	4.2.1.4
Requests to develop housing below identified densities in the sites inventory and analysis	4.1.2.4
Typical timeframes between approval for a housing development project and application for building permits	4.1.2.4 Table 4-7

Does the analysis demonstrate the jurisdiction’s action(s) to mitigate nongovernmental constraints that create a gap between planning for housing to accommodate all income levels and the construction of housing to accommodate all income levels?

Zoning for a Variety of Housing Types

Government Code section, 65583, subdivisions (a)(4), (c)(1), and subdivision 65583.2 subdivision (c)

Provide an analysis of zoning and availability of sites for a variety of housing types including the following:

Description of Requirement	Section Number
Multifamily Rental Housing	4.1.1.3
Housing for Agricultural Employees (permanent and seasonal) (compliance with Health and Safety Code sections 17021.5, 17021.6, and 17021.8	4.1.1.3.4
Emergency Shelters (including compliance with new development/parking standards pursuant to AB 139/Gov. Code § 65583 subd. (a)(4)(A)).	4.1.1.3.1
Low Barrier Navigation Centers	4.1.1.3.2
Transitional Housing	4.1.1.3.1
Supportive Housing (including compliance with AB 2162, statutes of 2019)	4.1.1.3.1
Single-Room Occupancy Units	4.1.1.3.6
Manufactured homes, including compliance with Gov. Code § 65852.3	4.1.1.3.7
Mobile Home Parks	4.1.1.3.7
Accessory Dwelling Units	4.1.5

Comments:

Site Inventory and Analysis

Government Code, section 65583, subdivision (a)(3), section 65583.1, subdivision

See “Housing Element Sites Inventory Guidebook” and “Default Density Standard Option” at [HCD’s technical assistance memos](https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/housing-element-memos.shtml) (https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/housing-element-memos.shtml)

See [Site Inventory Form](https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/Site_inventory_template09022020.xlsm) (https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/Site_inventory_template09022020.xlsm) and [Site Inventory Form Instructions](https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/Site_inventory_instructions.pdf) (https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/Site_inventory_instructions.pdf)

Site Inventory – The site inventory must be prepared using the form adopted by HCD. An electronic copy of the site inventory is due at the time the adopted housing element is submitted to HCD for review and can be sent to siteinventory@hcd.ca.gov.

Site Inventory

Description of Requirement	Section Number
<i>Sites Inventory Form Listing:</i> Parcel listing by parcel number, size, general plan and zoning, existing uses on non-vacant sites, realistic capacity, level of affordability by income group, publicly owned sites (optional).	7.2 Table B-4_6
<i>Prior Identified Sites:</i> Address whether sites are adequate to accommodate lower income needs based on identification in the prior planning period for non- vacant sites or two or more for vacant sites.	Table B-4
Map of sites	Figure B-1

Did the jurisdiction use the sites inventory form adopted by HCD?

Site Inventory Analysis and Methodology

Description of Requirement	Section Number
<i>RHNA Progress:</i> List the number of pending, approved or permitted units by income group based on actual or anticipated sales prices and rents since the beginning of the projection period	2.7.1 Table 3-32
<i>Environmental Constraints:</i> Address any known environmental or other constraints, conditions or circumstances, including mitigation measures, which impede development in the planning period	4.2.3.1-4
<i>Appropriate density:</i> Identification of zoning to accommodate RHNA for lower- income households: Identify zones meeting the “default” density (Gov. Code § 65583.2 subd. (c)(3)(B)) or; Identify and analyze zones with densities less than the “deemed appropriate” (default) density that are appropriate to accommodate lower RHNA.	3.02.1 3.02.4

Comments:

Description of Requirement	Section Number
<p><i>Capacity:</i> Describe the methodology used in quantifying the number of units that can be accommodated on each APN:</p> <p>If development is required to meet a minimum density, identify the minimum density, or;</p> <p>Describe the methodology used to determine realistic capacity accounting for land use controls and site improvement requirements, typical density trends for projects of similar affordability, and current or planned infrastructure.</p> <p>For sites with zones allowing non-residential uses, demonstrate the likelihood of residential development</p>	<p>3.02.2</p> <p>Table 3-1</p>
<p><i>Infrastructure:</i> Existing or planned infrastructure to accommodate the regional housing need, including water, sewer and dry utilities</p>	<p>4.2.4</p>
<p><i>Small and large sites:</i> Sites identified to accommodate lower RHNA that are less than one-half acre or larger than 10 acres require analysis to establish they are adequate to accommodate the development of affordable units.</p>	<p>7.2.4</p>
<p><i>Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing:</i> Identified sites throughout the community that affirmatively furthers fair housing (see page 5 of checklist)</p>	<p>7.3.3</p>
<p><i>Nonvacant Sites Analysis:</i> For nonvacant sites, demonstrate the potential and likelihood of additional development within the planning period based on extent to which existing uses may constitute an impediment to additional residential development, past experience with converting existing uses to higher density residential development, current market demand for the existing use, any existing leases or other contracts that would perpetuate the existing use or prevent redevelopment of the site for additional residential development, development trends, market conditions, and regulatory or other incentives or standards to encourage additional residential development on these sites</p>	<p>7.2.4</p>
<p>If nonvacant sites accommodate 50 percent or more of the lower-income RHNA, demonstrate the existing use is not an impediment to additional development and will likely discontinue in the planning period, including adopted findings based on substantial evidence.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Nonvacant sites that include residential units (either existing or demolished) that are/were occupied by, or subject to, affordability agreements for lower-income households within 5 years are subject to a housing replacement program. (Gov. Code § 65583.2 subd. (g)(3))</p>	<p>NA</p>

Please note: This checklist does not include new requirements related to zoning for sites accommodating the moderate and above moderate income pursuant to AB 725, statutes of 2020 as this requirement is not enacted until 2022.

Comments:

Alternative Methods to Accommodate the RHNA: Optional

Description of Requirement	Section Number
Accessory Dwelling Units: Analyze the number and affordability level of ADU units projected to be built within the planning period, including resources and incentives and other relevant factors such as potential constraints, and the likelihood of availability for rent	
Existing Residential Units: number and affordability level of units rehabilitated, converted or preserved that meet the provisions of alternative adequate sites. In addition, this includes units in a motel, hotel, or hostel that are converted to residential units and made available to persons experiencing homelessness as part of a COVID-19 response and acquisition of mobile home park. If using this option, the adequate site alternative checklist must be provided.	
Other: Jurisdictions are encouraged to consult with HCD regarding other alternative methods options including new manufactured housing park hook-ups, floating homes/live aboard berths, conversion of military housing, adaptive reuse of commercial uses, or other housing opportunities unique to the community to ensure their adequacy to accommodate RHNA.	

Other Miscellaneous Requirements

Also see Technical Advisories issued by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research at: [New state legislation related to General Plans Appendix C](http://opr.ca.gov/docs/OPR_Appendix_C_final.pdf) (http://opr.ca.gov/docs/OPR_Appendix_C_final.pdf) and [Fire Hazard Planning General Plan Technical Advice Series](http://opr.ca.gov/docs/Final_6.26.15.pdf) (http://opr.ca.gov/docs/Final_6.26.15.pdf)

Description of Requirement	Section Number
Description of the means by which consistency with the general plan will be achieved and maintained. (Gov. Code § 65583 subd. (c)(8))	1.3
Description of construction, demolition, and conversion of housing for lower- and moderate-income households within the Coastal Zone (if applicable). (Gov. Code § 65588 subds. (c) and (d))	NA
Description of opportunities for energy conservation in residential development. (Gov. Code § 65583 subd. (a)(8))	5.1-2
Description of consistency with water and sewer priority requirements pursuant to SB 1087 (Gov. Code § 65589.7)	4.2.4.1-2
Other elements of the general plan triggered by housing element adoption: Disadvantaged Communities (Gov. Code § 65302.10) Flood Hazard and Management (Gov. Code § 65302 subds. (d)(3) and (g)(2)(B)) Fire Hazard (Gov. Code § 65302 and 65302.5) Environmental Justice (Gov. Code § 65302 subd. (h)) Climate Adaptation	1.3

Comments: Environmental Justice

Schedule of Actions/Programs

Government Code, section 65583, subdivisions (c)(1 – 7), and (10)

For adequate site programs See “Housing Element Sites Inventory Guidebook” at [HCD’s technical assistance memos](https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/housing-element-memos.shtml) (https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/housing-element-memos.shtml)

Program Description	Program numbers	Section Number
<i>Program(s) to provide adequate sites (large/small sites, incentives for mixed use/nonvacant sites, publicly owned sites, annexation, etc.)</i>	Pol 1.1	7.2.1
If required: Program to accommodate a shortfall of adequate sites to accommodate the lower RHNA. This program must meet the specific criteria identified in Gov. Code § 65583.2 subd. (h) and (i).	NA	
If required: Program to accommodate an unaccommodated need from the previous planning period pursuant to Gov code § 65584.09	NA	
If required: Program when vacant/nonvacant sites to accommodate lower RHNA have been identified in multiple housing elements, if needed. (Gov. Code § 65583.2 subd. (c))	NA	
If required: Program to provide replacement units when occupied by, or deed restricted to lower-income households within the last 5 years, if needed. (Gov. Code § 65583.2 subd. (g)(3))	NA	
<i>Program(s) to assist in the development of housing to accommodate extremely-low, very-low, low or moderate-income households, including special needs populations</i>	Prg-1.3, Prg-4.1, Prg-4.2, Prg-4.3, Prg-4.4 Pol-4.5	
<i>Program to address governmental and nongovernmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing</i>	Prg-1.6, Prg-1.10. Prg-1.11	
<i>Program(s) to conserve and improve the condition of the existing affordable housing stock</i>	Prg-1.4. Prg-1.5, Goal 2 Pol-2.3, Pol-2.4, Pol-2.5, Pol-2.6	

Comments:

Program Description	Program numbers	Section Number
<i>Program(s) to promote and affirmative further fair housing opportunities</i>	Prg-6.2, Prg-6.4, Prg-6.5, Prg-6.6, Prg-6.7	
<i>Program(s) to preserve units at-risk of conversion from affordable to market-rate rents.</i>	Prg-6.3, Prg-6.4, Prg-6.5	
<i>Program(s) to incentivize and promote the creation of accessory dwelling units that can be offered at an affordable rent.</i>	Prg-1.2	

- Do programs specify specific clear commitment, meaningful actions, which will have beneficial impact within the planning period?

- Do programs identify timing, objectives (quantified where appropriate), and responsible parties, if appropriate for implementation?

Quantified Objectives

Government Code, section 65583, subdivisions (b)

For an example table addressing this requirement visit [California Housing and Community Development Building Blocks](https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/building-blocks/program-requirements/program-overview.shtml) (https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/building-blocks/program-requirements/program-overview.shtml)

Description of Requirement	Section Number
Estimate the number of units likely to be constructed, rehabilitated and conserved or preserved by income level, including extremely low-income, during the planning period	6.7 Table 6-2

Comments:

1.0 Introduction

The California legislature identifies the attainment of an acceptable home and suitable living environment for every citizen as California's main goal for housing. Recognizing the important role local government planning plays to achieve this goal, the State mandates that all cities and counties prepare and adopt a housing element as part of their comprehensive General Plans. In the housing element, State law requires local governments to adequately plan to meet the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Unlike the other mandatory elements, the housing element is subject to detailed statutory requirements regarding its content and must be updated every five or eight years, according to a schedule set by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). The housing element is also subject to mandatory review and certification by HCD.

This 2023-2031 update of Guadalupe's Housing Element includes policies and programs to address the City's housing needs through 2031. It serves as the short-term version of the long-term vision encapsulated in the Guadalupe 2042 General Plan which addresses comprehensive housing needs for residents of all income levels within the City through 2042 and serves as one of the bastions for allocation of land use in the future. This 2023-2031 update provides a comprehensive analysis of Guadalupe's demographic, economic, and housing characteristics as required by State law. The Element also contains an evaluation of the City's progress in implementing the 2019 Housing Element. Based on the City's housing needs, available resources, constraints and opportunities for housing production and preservation, and its past performance, the 2023-2031 update of the Housing Element establishes a strategy of goals, measurable objectives, and related policies and programs to address present and future housing needs of the City.

1.1 Community Context

The City of Guadalupe is located within the rich agricultural region of the Santa Maria Valley, in the northwest portion of Santa Barbara County. It was incorporated in 1946. Surrounded by farmlands, the City serves as an agricultural service center for processing and shipping of many of the crops from the productive farms in the valley. The predominant land use within City limits is residential as the City provides homes for persons employed in the production, processing, and shipping of agricultural products, among others. Compared to other cities in the County, Guadalupe has been a relatively stable community, experiencing modest population growth over the past three decades.

The City occupies approximately 1.31 square miles including the sphere of influence. According to the American Community Survey of the United States Census Bureau, Guadalupe had a population of 6,770 in 2010, 7,218 in 2015, and 7,654 in 2020. Between 2010 and 2020, the population of Guadalupe grew at a rate of 1.3 percent a year, while Santa Barbara County grew at 0.7 percent a year. Approximately 88 percent of the population claims Hispanic origin with the majority (79 percent) of Mexican descent. With much of the workforce involved in agriculture, median household income is below State and County medians triggering the need for affordable workforce housing. Household incomes are in general among

the lowest in Santa Barbara County and as a result, many Guadalupe residents fall in the income ranges that need affordable housing.

Between 2000 and 2009, Guadalupe's median home value more than doubled to \$313,500, significantly outpacing the area's income growth; since then, however, Guadalupe's median home price decreased by 35 percent to a 2015 median home value of \$203,100 and rebounded to \$337,100 in 2021 (US Census, ACS, DP04, 2009, 2015, 2021). Historically, in part because of increases in housing prices, overcrowding has been a major issue in Guadalupe, putting emphasis on the need for more affordable housing.

The construction of projects identified as affordable housing in Guadalupe started in the 1980s. The first were Treasure Park and Bonita Pacifica, which helped with home ownership. People's Self-Help Housing, Habitat for Humanity, Santa Barbara County Housing Authority, and Community Development Block Grants have provided financing and administration of affordable housing programs in Guadalupe.

In 2021, Guadalupe's housing stock consisted of approximately 2,180 residential units. Of these, 77 percent were single-family houses or condominiums, 23 percent were multi-family units including 1 percent mobile homes and trailers (US Census, ACS, DP04, 2021). Most of the residential growth (85 percent) occurred over 30 years ago, the age when most homes begin to require major repairs. Nearly two-thirds of the housing stock in Guadalupe was built before 1990 and another third was built between 1990 and 2010. The last decade saw the construction of 3.5 percent of the housing stock.

1.2 Public Participation

1.2.1 Consolidated Outreach Activities

During the General Plan process, cities and counties in California must provide opportunities to involve residents in the community planning process to ensure that policies reflect the aspirations of the community. This housing element is a product of broad community participation by residents and stakeholders of Guadalupe, including City Staff, the School District, and City Council jointly with the preparation of the Guadalupe General Plan. Input from all segments of the community is to help assure that appropriate housing strategies are more efficiently and effectively evaluated, developed, and implemented. During preparation of the update to the Housing Element, citizen and stakeholder participation was actively sought in the following ways:

- Four community workshops (10/12/2017, 11/7/2017, 3/7/2018, and 3/21/2018), a hearing held jointly with Council Meeting (10/23/2018), and a public meeting to kick off preparation of the 6th Cycle Housing Element (1/10/2023) to gather input on existing housing needs, housing conditions, opportunities and constraints, and other housing issues and concerns.
- A public workshop was held for the draft 6th Cycle Housing Element, prior to City Council Meeting (6/22/2023) for discussion, recommendations, and approval of the Draft Housing Element.

- Public notices of the community workshops were posted on the City's website, in the local newspaper, and at City Hall.
- Notices were in both English and Spanish; they were also mailed out in addition to postings.
- The following other activities took place:
 - The Draft Housing Element was reviewed by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Comments provided by HCD are addressed in this version of the document.
 - A public hearing is anticipated jointly with Council Meeting to discuss the Housing Element following revisions due to comments on this draft from HCD
 - Final submission of the revised Housing Element to HCD.

Outreach to Special Needs Populations - All public meeting notices were posted for all residents. All public meeting notices asked for those in need of special accommodations to contact the City for assistance. Surveys related to the meetings and the housing element were distributed via email to individuals and organizations that support special needs populations. Respondents to the surveys included those from special needs populations.

1.2.2 Special 6th Cycle Outreach Findings

Kick-Off Workshop & Comments

The special outreach effort for the 6th Cycle Housing Element culminated in a workshop on January 10, 2023. The effort included both a survey and the workshop. The survey recapped the issues and aspirations the Guadalupe Community expressed in previous public meetings that related to housing, asked for confirmation of the issues and preferences, and offered respondents an opportunity to update them or add new ones.

From previous meetings, participants identified several **strengths** of Guadalupe in terms of housing as: the presence of strong residential neighborhoods; and the relatively affordable housing in the City when compared to other communities nearby. They also expressed such aspirations for the future of housing as: the development of **affordable** workforce housing; expanding the stock of low-income housing; and also expanding the availability of shelters.

Participants expressed similar levels of preference for three **types of housing development** that included small apartments in the lead followed by duplexes and single-family detached homes. These preferences reflected an intrinsic aspiration for affordability.

When asked about preferences for **types of affordable housing**, participants expressed preference for secondary dwelling units in the lead followed by apartments. There was comparatively low aspiration for mobile homes.

When asked specifically about preferences for **special needs housing**, participants expressed preference for all types but at varying degrees as follows:

- Topping the list are farm worker housing and senior housing
- Followed by single-parent and linguistically challenged (or new migrant worker) housing

- With a comparatively lower desire for disability housing.
- Four years ago, participants did not give much weight to homeless shelters.

The survey for the 6th Cycle Plan sought to find out whether priorities for housing have remained the same or have changed. The survey, which was in both English and Spanish, was disseminated widely to many stakeholders including residents, housing agencies, and providers about a weeks before the workshop and at the workshop. Returns were collected before, during, and after the workshop. Approximately forty participants attended the workshop and engaged in the meeting.

Survey results largely confirmed the issues that were most important for members of the community and the priorities, preferences, and aspirations of residents. Nevertheless, a few new issues have arisen and some items gained higher priority.

On issues with housing, The tree top priorities in order of importance are cost and affordability, homelessness, and options or choices with housing. Notably, homelessness has become an issue of grave concern among respondents. The other new issues mentioned concern subletting in the new Pasadera development leading to crowding and shortage of parking as well as lack of trash receptacles and maintenance at the new parks in the development.

On priorities for general housing types, single family units and duplexes jumped ahead to first and second places respectively, followed closely by small apartment complexes. These confirm the aspirations for units that are large enough for families but remain affordable.

Specifically on affordable housing types, apartments and other multi-family units jumped ahead of accessory dwelling units. Mobile homes remained a distant third.

Respondents continue to recognize and express the importance of all forms of special needs housing. Topping the list are farmworker and senior housing in first and second place, respectively. Single-parent housing is in a not-too-distant third place. Rounding off the list are housing to suit those with disability and recent migrants.

Finally, respondents are partial to the development of future new housing in the neighborhoods designated from the General Plan development process as future growth areas. With little difference in the numbers of respondents, the priorities are as follows:

- a. The northeast residential area east of Mary Buren Elementary School
- b. New Obispo Street Neighborhood east of Obispo St. and north of 4th Street
- c. The downtown mixed-use corridor and surrounding residential neighborhood
- d. DJ Farms Specific Plan Area now popularly known as Pasadera.

Draft Housing Element Workshop & Comments

The special outreach effort for the 6th Cycle Housing Element continued with a workshop on June 22, 2023 to receive input on the draft document, which was distributed widely for a 30-day public review to a broad cross-section of stakeholders including residents, workers, City officials, affordable housing

developers, and County officials. Comments from attendees related to questions on State requirements on preparing the housing element but not on the contents of the draft document.

Subsequently on July 11, 2023, a hearing took place during the City Council Meeting where the draft was approved for submission to HCD. Speakers re-emphasized the continuing need for affordable housing but did not question policies or programs in the draft housing element.

1.2.3 Inclusion of Outreach Findings in Housing Element

Discussions and findings from all public outreach efforts serve as the basis of space allocation for types of housing in the new Housing Element. Findings indicate that concerns relate to housing for families, seniors, and farmworkers. Housing types include multi-family, single-family, and single-room occupancy units. Residents of Guadalupe also support infill development that is affordable by design in the downtown core of Guadalupe and other growth centers in the northeast, Obispo, and Pasadera neighborhoods. This update of the Housing Element captures these community aspirations for housing.

1.2.4 Expansion of Future Outreach

As described at the end of section 1.2.1, the City made consistent efforts to include the public, particularly special needs populations, in the planning process through workshops. However, moving forward, the City plans to employ additional methods for public outreach efforts, particularly to assure the inclusion of lower-income and special needs households and neighborhoods with higher concentrations of lower-income households. For example, the City has begun collaboration with the Children and Family Resource Services (CFRS), the Santa Barbara County Education Office (SBCEO), and the Santa Barbara County Promotores Network (SBCPN) in conducting targeted stakeholder interviews in association with respective public workshops on planning issues, of which housing is perennial.

["Promotores" in English translates to "promoters," meaning people who actively promote or encourage something, often referring to individuals who organize or advocate for a particular cause, event, or idea.]

The SBCPN consists of members of the community, neighbors, and activists, who have gained the trust of the people. They work jointly with partners on several outreach initiatives through neighbor-to-neighbor interactions and tabling at cultural events in the County. Therefore, they can identify community events where community health workers and Promotores (CHW & Ps) already table and assist in dissemination of information, education, and soliciting of input from a wide range of people who would otherwise not participate in planning initiatives.

Following HCD's notification of acceptance of the draft 6th Cycle Housing Element as 'substantially meeting State requirements', the City plans to conduct proactive outreach to focused stakeholders in addition to 7 day posting and distribution of the document to the public, the SBCPN and partners, via email, three public locations, and the Santa Maria Times. The targeted engagement of lower-income and special needs households with the help of the SBCPN and its partners will be conducted in conjunction with a public hearing at Council chambers. It is anticipated that all these outreach efforts will precede Council approval of a resolution to adopt the 6th Cycle Housing Element.

1.3 Consistency with Other Elements of the General Plan

State law requires that all portions of the General Plan be internally consistent. The City of Guadalupe's adopted 2042 General Plan consists of thirteen subject areas consolidated into various elements. These include the original mandated subjects on land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. The Plan also covers Environmental Justice and Air Quality subjects as mandated by Senate Bill 100 for disadvantaged communities. For further depth, the General Plan covers four optional subjects including economic development, public services and facilities, community design, and health. There is also a Coastal Zone Element that applies to the River View Specific Plan Area in the westernmost part of the City. This Housing Element builds upon the other elements and is consistent with the policies in the General Plan. For example, the Housing Element incorporates residential development capacities established in the land Use Element and discussion of infrastructure and public services based upon information from the land Use and Public Facilities Elements. As the Housing Element is updated through time, it should maintain internal consistency with the General Plan.

As the housing element is implemented and the municipal code is amended to conform with the policies and programs of the housing element, these changes should reflect in the continual updates to the policies in the General Plan. Where site modifications require updates to the land use map, these changes should also reflect in amendments to the General Plan.

Senate Bill 1087 of 2005 requires cities to provide a copy of their Housing Elements to local water and sewer providers, and also requires that these agencies provide priority hookups for developments with lower-income housing. The City of Guadalupe is its own water and sewer provider; there is no separate water or sewer district. Staff members from the City Public Works Department were consulted during the preparation of the Housing Element, in compliance with this requirement, and key water and sewer service staff are provided with a copy of the Housing Element upon adoption.

The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) set a due date of February 15, 2023 for this 2023-2031 revision of the Housing Element and required updates to the Safety and Conservation Elements (pursuant to GC Section 65302(g)), and an Environmental Justice Element (pursuant to GC Section 56430) of the General Plan on or before this update of the Housing Element. These elements have been appropriately updated during the development of the Guadalupe 2042 General Plan.

1.4 Organization of the Element

The Housing Element is organized into six chapters. This first chapter is introductory, touching on the statutory requirements of a Housing Element. Chapter 2 provides assessment of housing needs in terms of subject matters outlined by State law. It discusses characteristics of the population, employment, household, and housing stock; special housing needs; assisted housing at-risk of conversion; and future growth according to the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments. Chapter 3 describes the resources available in Guadalupe to achieve the City's allocation of regional housing needs, including land resources, financial and administrative resources, and energy conservation opportunities. Chapter 4 provides a discussion of both governmental and nongovernmental constraints. Chapter 5 discusses opportunities for conserving energy in residential development. Finally, Chapter 6 contains goals,

measurable objectives, policies, and programs for housing in Guadalupe based on community input and background research. Appendices include additional details as follows:

- Appendix A provides a review of the 2015 and mid-cycle 2019 Housing Elements;
- Appendix B has detailed analysis of sites suitable for residential development;
- Appendix C covers the all-new detailed discussion on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing; and
- Appendix D includes a schedule of fees.

2.0 Housing Needs Assessment

State law requires local governments to adequately plan to meet their existing and projected housing needs, including their share of the regional housing needs. This chapter provides an assessment of housing needs based on analyses of general characteristics and trends in the population, employment, households, and housing stock. The chapter looks at characteristics of disadvantaged groups with special housing needs and whether any existing assisted housing units are at-risk of conversion to market rate housing. Finally, the chapter examines the City's projected housing needs based on the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments' 2023-2031 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

This Housing Needs Assessment relies on the most recent data from the US Census of Population and Housing, US Economic Census, California Department of Finance, California Employment Development Department (EDD), Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG), and other relevant sources. The discussion includes implications of findings for the City's housing policies and programs.

2.1. Population Characteristics

2.1.1 Population Growth Trends

Population growth is a primary determinant of housing need. The City of Guadalupe has experienced a steady population growth since 2000. Table 2-1 shows that between 2000 and 2020, the City's population increased by 35 percent to 7,654 people, which represents 1.7 percent of the total County population. Guadalupe's growth equates to an annual increase of 1.8 percent. By comparison, Santa Barbara County's total 2020 population of 444,895 represents an annual growth of 0.6 percent over the same period. Although a relatively small city, Guadalupe has been growing approximately three times as fast as the County over the last two decades.

Table 2-1: Population Growth Trends. Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2000 – 2020

Year	Guadalupe City	Santa Barbara County
2000	5,653	399,347
2010	6,770	416,051
2015	7,218	435,850
2020	7,654	444,895
Percent change	35%	11%
Annual percent change	1.8%	0.6%

Source: U.S Census Bureau, DEC SF4, Table DP1, 2000; U.S Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05; U.S Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05; U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05.

2.1.2 Age

Age characteristics of the population influence housing needs as different age groups have different housing needs based on lifestyles, family types, income levels, and housing preferences. Table 2-2

compares the age distributions of the population in the City and the County in 2020. The table depicts a more youthful population in Guadalupe than Santa Barbara County while the County has a higher share of the senior population. For instance, in 2020, 45 percent of City residents were under the age of 25 compared to 35 percent in the County. Consistent with this distribution the median age in the City was 28 compared to 34 years in the County in 2020.

Table 2-2: Age Distribution - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020

Age Group	Guadalupe City		Santa Barbara County	
	Persons	Percent	Persons	Percent
Under 18 years	2,665	33%	105,696	22%
18 to 24 years	991	12%	63,094	13%
25 to 44 years	1,919	24%	110,272	23%
45 to 64 years	1,464	18%	97,813	20%
65 to 74 years	599	7%	61,995	13%
75 to 84 years	334	4%	37,285	8%
85 years and over	67	1%	10,494	2%
Total Population	8,039	100%	486,649	100%
Median age (years)	28		34	

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S0101.

2.1.3 Race and Ethnicity

Table 2-3 reveals that the City of Guadalupe depicts slightly more racial diversity than Santa Barbara County. While approximately two thirds (62 percent) of the City’s population is white, nearly three quarters (72 percent) of the County population is white. There are hardly any stark differences in the composition of other races between the City and the County. Where the difference is most noticeable is in Hispanic origin. While 46 percent of County residents claimed Hispanic origin in 2020, two times the share or 92 percent of City residents claimed Hispanic origin.

Table 2-3: Population by Race/Ethnicity - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020

Race and Ethnicity	Guadalupe City		Santa Barbara County	
	Persons	Percent	Persons	Percent
<i>Racial Distribution</i>				
White alone	4,719	62%	319,547	72%
Black or African American alone	33	0%	8,474	2%
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	141	2%	4,941	1%
Asian alone	274	4%	24,678	6%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	79	1%	528	0%
Some other race alone	1492	20%	43,441	10%
Two or more races	916	12%	43,286	10%

Race and Ethnicity	Guadalupe City		Santa Barbara County	
	Persons	Percent	Persons	Percent
Total Population	7,654	100%	444,895	100%
<i>Hispanic Origin</i>				
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	7,035	92%	203,207	46%
Not Hispanic or Latino	619	8%	241,688	54%
All Origins	7,654	100%	444,895	100%

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05.

2.1.4 Conclusion

Population data indicates steady growth which would suggest the need for a steady supply of housing. The youthful population could indicate either the need for housing to suit large families with youthful dependents or housing for households of young adults. A subsequent section of this chapter on household characteristics further explores these potential needs.

2.2 Employment Trends

2.2.1 Current Employment

Different types of employment opportunities determine household incomes which in turn determine the types and sizes of housing that households could afford. According to the American Community Survey, both Guadalupe and Santa Barbara County depicted similar levels of labor force with approximately three and a half out of five of residents in the labor force in 2020. Approximately 5 percent of those in the labor force were unemployed in 2020, reflecting statewide and national trends. The next subsection and the section on household characteristics further explore the distribution of incomes by employment type and households respectively and implications for housing affordability.

Table 2-4: Labor Force and Employment Rates - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020

	Guadalupe City		Santa Barbara County	
	Persons	Percent	Persons	Percent
In Labor Force*	5,198	68%	356,699	64%
Employed	-	65%	-	60%
Unemployed	-	4%	-	6%
Not in Labor Force	2,841	32%	129,950	36%
All ages 16 and over	8,039		486,649	

*Ages 16 and over in labor force.

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S2301.

Table 2-5 shows the distribution of employment by occupation and median earnings. In 2020, the largest employment sector for Guadalupe residents was farming, fishing, and forestry with approximately one out of every four employed residents. With a median earning of just over \$23,000,

agriculture provided nearly \$15,000 more in annual salary than the lowest-paying sector (Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance), but it provided \$45,000 lower annual salary than the highest-paying sector (Art, Design, Entertainment, Sports, and Media). Close examination of the distribution suggests that working residents of Guadalupe fall predominantly into occupations that pay low to mid-level salaries that are below \$40,000 a year. Housing affordability would depend on the number of income earners in households and families.

Table 2-5: Distribution of Employment by Occupation and Median Earning – Guadalupe City, 2020

Industry	Persons	Percent	Median Earning
Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations	825	24%	23,171
Office and administrative support occupations	394	12%	52,237
Sales and related occupations	326	10%	23,750
Material moving occupations	311	9%	25,898
Healthcare support occupations	255	8%	18,450
Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations	191	6%	7,165
Construction and extraction occupations	162	5%	32,027
Management occupations	153	5%	32,014
Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations	142	4%	36,023
Production occupations	117	3%	26,902
Transportation occupations	91	3%	30,865
Personal care and service occupations	77	2%	15,709
Protective service occupations	76	2%	43,333
Food preparation and serving related occupations	71	2%	14,777
Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media occupations	61	2%	67,882
Educational instruction, and library occupations	46	1%	30,278
Business and financial operations occupations	37	1%	45,795
Healthcare practitioners and technical occupations	36	1%	43,125
Life, physical, and social science occupations	11	0%	-
Architecture and engineering occupations	8	0%	-
Legal occupations	3	0%	-
Community and social service occupations	0	0%	-
Computer and mathematical occupations	0	0%	-
All Employed	3,393	100%	26,646

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S2401; U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B24011.

2.2.2 Projected Job Growth

The numbers and types of new future jobs affect future housing affordability. Table 2-6 shows projected job growth by occupation for the Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Goleta Metropolitan Statistical Area (Santa Barbara MSA) over the decade from 2018 to 2028. Total employment is projected to grow by 9 percent during this period for an increase of 19,000 new jobs. This would bring the employment of Santa Barbara MSA to approximately 222,100 by 2028 (California Employment Development Department, 2020). Close examination reveals that economic sectors with the most growth are a mixture of typically well-paying occupations such as Information, as well as the typically low-paying occupations such as Construction, Leisure and Hospitality, and Educational Services. Table 2-6 shows, however, that low paying occupations would dominate in job growth. This would not bode well in terms of housing affordability for Guadalupe residents who are concentrated in the low-paying job sectors. Without multiple income-earning persons in households, difficulties with housing affordability could remain.

Table 2-6: Protected Job Growth by Occupation from 2018 to 2028 – Santa Maria & Santa Barbara Metropolitan Statistical Area

Occupation Title	Annual Average Employment		Employment Change	
	2018	2028	Jobs	Percent
Information	4,000	4,700	700	18%
Educational Services (Private), Health Care, and Social Assistance	27,400	31,600	4,200	15%
Construction	8,800	10,000	1,200	14%
Leisure and Hospitality	28,200	31,400	3,200	11%
Professional and Business Services	22,700	25,200	2,500	11%
Self-Employment	14,400	15,700	1,300	9%
Total Farm	22,900	24,800	1,900	8%
Government	39,000	42,200	3,200	8%
Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities	3,400	3,600	200	6%
Wholesale Trade	5,100	5,400	300	6%
Manufacturing	12,900	13,600	700	5%
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	27,200	27,400	200	1%
Retail Trade	18,700	18,300	-400	-2%
Financial Activities	6,700	6,500	-200	-3%
Mining and Logging	1,000	800	-200	-20%
Private Household Workers	700	500	-200	-29%
Total Employment	222,100	241,000	18,900	9%

Source: California Employment Development Department, 2022.

2.2.3 Jobs-Housing Balance

A regional balance of jobs to housing is necessary for housing demand to match with supply. When the number of jobs significantly exceeds the housing supply, the rental and for-sale housing markets may

become saturated, requiring households to pay much larger shares of their incomes for housing than would otherwise be necessary. A tight housing market can also result in overcrowding as households double up in available units or in longer commute times as workers seek more affordable housing outside the region. According to the *Regional Growth Forecast 2050 (2019)* for the Santa Barbara Council of Governments (SBCAG), the relationship between jobs and housing keeps gaining increasing importance. The problem of jobs to housing imbalance intensified in recent years and workers have increasingly crowded into the limited available housing in Santa Barbara County or sought less-expensive housing outside of Santa Barbara County.

Conventional wisdom dictates that reasonable jobs to housing ratios should be within the range of 1.0 to 1.5 jobs to one housing unit (SBCAG, 2007). A ratio above 1.5 could indicate that there may be an insufficient supply of housing to meet the needs of the local workforce. A ratio below 1.0 could denote an insufficient supply of jobs to support the local population. Table 2-7 shows that the City of Guadalupe had jobs to housing ratio of approximately 0.72 compared to the County ratio of 1.2.

In 2020, Guadalupe had 1,436 jobs for 3,394 employed workers within the City. This already shows insufficiency of jobs for the labor force. It also means that large numbers of the labor force likely commuted to outlying areas for work. U.S. Census data reveals that Guadalupe had very little “In-Area Employment Efficiency” for all Jobs in 2020. Only 18 percent of the jobs within the City are held by residents while 82 percent are held by those who lived outside the City. Similarly, 91 percent of employed residents worked outside the City. This indicates that workers from other parts of the County continue to move to Guadalupe for its relative affordability, but this external demand can cause increase in the cost of housing in the City. The 2042 General Plan recommends that the City should monitor housing costs for affordability and take steps to create new jobs that suit the skills of residents to reduce commute times and improve the quality of life for residents.

Table 2-7: Jobs to Housing Ratio - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020

	Guadalupe City	Santa Barbara County
Total Housing Units	1,993	159,317
Total Jobs	1,436	190,550
Jobs to Housing Ratio	0.72	1.20

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05; US Census, On-The-Map Tool of the Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics, 2019.

2.2.4 Conclusion

The employment characteristics and trends indicate a strong need for moderate-income and lower-income housing to support the housing needs of residents employed by the farming and services sectors. The demand for affordable homes and apartments is likely to remain very high as many of the new jobs created are not likely to provide the incomes needed to buy market-rate homes in the region. It is therefore important to provide adequate affordable housing, particularly for farm and service

workers. The City should also monitor housing prices as new units are built and continue to cultivate local job growth in order to reduce the imbalance between jobs and housing.

2.3 Household Characteristics

2.3.1 Growth in Households

Household characteristics are important indicators of the type and size of housing needed in a city. The U.S. Census Bureau defines a "household" as all persons occupying a housing unit, which may include single persons living alone, families related through marriage or blood, or unrelated persons who share a single unit. Under this definition, the number of households in a community has the most direct effect on the quantity of housing units needed irrespective of the sizes of or amenities within the units. Table 2-8 shows trends in the growth of households in Guadalupe from 2000 to 2020. The City experienced a large growth spurt of 132 percent between 2000 and 2010 followed by a slight decline in growth from 2010 to 2015. In 2020, there were 1,993 households in Guadalupe reflecting the latest period of growth and an average annual rate of 1 percent between 2015 and 2020. This result is consistent with the previous finding that many people in the region choose to live in Guadalupe for the relative affordability of its housing even if they do not have employment within the City.

Table 2-8: Household Growth Trends - Guadalupe City, 2000 to 2020

Year	Households	Inter-Census Change	Annual Inter-Census Growth Rate
2000	264	-	-
2010	2,007	1,743	132%
2015	1,896	-111	-1%
2020	1,993	97	1%
Average Annual Growth (2000-2020)			33%

Source: U.S Census Bureau, DEC SF4, Table DP1, 2000; U.S Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05; U.S Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05; U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05.

2.3.2 Household Composition and Size

Table 2-9 provides a snapshot of family orientation among households in Guadalupe compared to Santa Barbara County. Households in the City are much more family-oriented than the County. Family households comprised approximately 85 percent of all households in the City while the County had 66 percent of family households. Similarly, family composition is more youthful in the City with 40 percent of all households having minor children under 18 years old compared to just 28 percent of all households in the County. Consistent with these data therefore, the City has larger average household and family sizes than the County. This suggests that housing in the City should cater mostly to relatively larger family households.

Table 2-9: Household Composition - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020

Type	Guadalupe City		Santa Barbara County	
	Households	Percent	Households	Percent
Total Households	1,912	100%	148,309	100%
Family Households	1,624	85%	97,397	66%
Households w/ children under 18 years	876	46%	42,187	28%
Non-Family Households	288	15%	50,912	34%
Average Household Size	4.00		2.86	
Average Family Size	4.25		3.37	

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1101.

Further scrutiny of the distribution of household sizes reveals in Table 2-10 that almost half of all households in Guadalupe had four or more persons in 2020. On the contrary, more than half of all households in the County had two or fewer persons per household. The data suggest that Guadalupe has a higher need for large housing units than some of the other communities in Santa Barbara County.

Table 2-10: Distribution of Household Sizes - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020

Persons per Household	Guadalupe City		Santa Barbara County	
	Households	Percent	Households	Percent
1-Person Household	266	14%	35,383	24%
2-Person Household	293	15%	48,122	32%
3-Person Household	309	16%	22,106	15%
4-Person Household	330	17%	20,442	14%
5-Person Household	340	18%	11,472	8%
6-Person Household	205	11%	5,472	4%
7-Person Household	169	9%	5,312	4%
Total Households	1,912	100%	148,309	100%
Average Household Size	4.00		2.86	

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B11016.

2.3.3 Household Income

Household income is a primary factor in housing affordability. Table 2-11 shows the breakdown of the City's households by income in 2020. It reveals a concentration of households in the low to lower middle-income categories with two out of five households earning less than \$50,000. This reinforces the need for affordable housing units in the City.

Table 2-11: Household Income - Guadalupe City, 2020

Income Range	Households	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Less than \$10,000	94	5%	5%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	71	4%	9%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	193	10%	19%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	254	13%	32%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	258	14%	46%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	369	19%	65%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	229	12%	77%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	325	17%	94%
\$150,000 or more	120	6%	100%
All Households	1,912		

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1901.

Comparative median income data in Table 2-12 for 2020 further confirms the need for more affordable housing in Guadalupe than some other communities in the region. Guadalupe had one of the three lowest median incomes among cities in Santa Barbara County in 2020 at \$68,000. Previously, Guadalupe had lower than 80 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI), which placed it under the classification of a “disadvantaged community” under the criteria of the State of California. In 2020, Guadalupe barely broke above the threshold. This provides further justification for relatively more affordable housing to adequately accommodate the lower incomes of the City’s residents.

Table 2-12: Comparative Median Household Incomes - Santa Barbara County and Cities, 2020

Jurisdiction	Median Household Income	Percent of County Median Income
State of California	78,672	93%
Santa Barbara County	84,846	100%
Goleta City	98,035	116%
Buellton City	105,694	125%
Carpinteria City	74,868	88%
Santa Maria City	67,634	80%
Lompoc City	57,071	67%
Guadalupe City	68,781	81%

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1901.

State law established household income categories for purposes of housing programs based on area median income (AMI). State law also requires quantification and analysis of housing needs for various-income groups. The criteria for the categories are as follows:

- Extremely low-income households earn up to 30 percent of AMI

- Very low-income households earn 31 percent to 50 percent of AMI
- Low-income households earn 51 percent to 80 percent of AMI
- Moderate income households earn 81 percent to 120 percent of AMI
- Above moderate-income households earn 121 percent and above of AMI.

Table 2-13 reveals that households in Guadalupe fall predominantly in the lower income categories with 60 percent in those “lower” categories compared to 40 percent in the “upper” categories. The table reflects the equivalent re-allocation (hypothetical) of Guadalupe’s share of 2023 to 2031 RHNA units according to the proportional distribution of households in the 2020 income groups.

Table 2-13: Median Income Distribution of Household Income Groups - Guadalupe City, 2020

Income Group	Definition (Percent AMI*)	2020 Income Range	2020 Households	Percent of Households	Equivalent 2023-2031 RHNA Units
Extremely Low	< 31%	< \$23,678	347	18%	78
Very low	31% - 50%	\$24,467 - \$39,463	468	24%	106
Low	51% - 80%	\$40,252 - \$63,140	365	19%	82
Moderate	81% - 120%	\$63,929 - \$94,710	276	14%	62
Above Moderate	> 121%	> \$95,499	456	24%	103
Total	-	-	1,912	100%	431

Notes:

*For a four-person household.

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1901; Santa Barbara County Association of Governments, Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan, 2023-2031.

2.3.4 Conclusion

Guadalupe has experienced steady household growth. This trend is anticipated to continue under the 2042 General Plan. To adequately accommodate residents, it is essential to provide adequately sized and reasonably priced housing for all types of households, but especially for large-family households. The demand for affordable homes including apartments is likely to remain high given the distribution of households by income groups.

2.4 Characteristics of the Housing Stock

2.4.1 Housing Types and Growth

The City of Guadalupe had 1,993 housing units in 2020. Table 2-14 reveals that the housing stock was predominantly single-family detached, which made up approximately two-thirds of the total stock. The next highest category with just over a quarter of the total stock is multi-family units. Compared to the County as a whole, Guadalupe had a much higher percentage of single-family detached units, a slightly lower percentage of multi-family units, and no mobile homes. Since City residents depict higher shares of large family households than the County, it is likely mobile homes would tend to be too small to suit

the housing needs of many Guadalupe residents although mobile homes provide an avenue for affordable units.

Table 2-14: Housing Unit Type- Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020

Housing Type	Guadalupe City		Santa Barbara County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1-Unit Detached	1,337	67%	91,448	57%
1-Unit Attached	108	5%	11,256	7%
2+ Units	548	28%	49,703	31%
Mobile Home	0	0%	6,841	4%
Total Units	1,993	100%	159,248	100%

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP04.

Table 2-15 shows growth in the housing stock over the past 30 years. The City began to experience relatively high growth in its housing stock in 2000 and the growth sustained through 2018. During its boom period from 2000 to 2018, the City produced an average of 78 housing units per year although annual average over the 30-year period was only 37 units per year. The data in Table 2-15 is from 2020 so the total number of housing units after 2019 is expected to be small. However, the data also shows that the rate of growth has slowed in 2019 compared to 2018, with an average annual increase since 2019 of 33 units compared to 100 units from 2015 to 2018.

Table 2-15: Age Distribution and Growth of Housing Stock - Guadalupe City, 2020

Year Built	Housing Units	Percent of 2019 Housing Stock	Cumulative Percent	Average Annual Increase
Moved in 1989 and earlier	345	18%	18%	
Moved in 1990 to 1999	205	11%	29%	21
Moved in 2000 to 2009	468	25%	53%	47
Moved in 2010 to 2014	461	24%	77%	92
Moved in 2015 to 2018	400	21%	98%	100
Moved in 2019 or later	33	2%	100%	33
Total	1,912	100%	-	-
Built 2010-2019	433	23%	-	43
Built 1989 to 2019	1,479	77%	-	37


Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP04.

2.4.2 Housing Age and Conditions

Housing age may be an important indicator of housing condition. Housing units built prior to 1978, before stringent limits on the amount of lead in paint were imposed, may have exterior or interior building components coated with lead-based paint. It is most likely that housing units of that era would also have lead-based paint in deteriorating conditions that can be hazardous and would require

rehabilitation. Figure 2-1 shows the age distribution of the housing stock. In combination with Table 2-15, the data indicates that approximately one third of the housing stock was constructed before 2000 or are more than 20 years old. These findings suggest that there may be a strong need for maintenance and rehabilitation, including remediation of lead-based paint, for a large portion of the City's housing stock. The lead-based Paint Hazard Control (LHC) and the lead Hazard Reduction (LHRD) grant programs provide opportunities to identify and control lead-based paint hazards in eligible privately-owned housing for renter or owner-occupants.

Figure 2-1: Age Distribution of Housing Stock - Guadalupe City, 2020



Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP04

In October 2017, graduate students from the City and Regional Planning Department of the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, conducted a citywide walking survey to identify the general structural conditions of homes in Guadalupe. Table 2-16 summarizes the results of this survey and others before it. The surveys categorized the conditions of the housing units as follows:

- **Good** – dwelling units in sound condition, required no repairs, or would only need minor maintenance (such as painting or patching of roof, etc.).
- **Fair** – dwelling units in moderate condition and required rehabilitation in the form of one or more structural repairs.
- **Poor** – dwelling units in dilapidated condition and required the replacement of all exterior elements and were generally considered not feasible for repairs, but rather for reconstruction.

The 2017 housing survey revealed that most of the housing stock (81 percent) was in good condition. A very small proportion was considered dilapidated and in need of replacement. The general trend depicts increase in overall quality of housing. This increase in quality could be partially due to rehabilitation

grant programs funded by the now defunct Guadalupe Redevelopment Agency and partially due to newly constructed housing.

Table 2-16: Trends in Housing Conditions - Guadalupe 2008 to 2017

Condition	Cal Poly Land Use Inventory 2008		Cal Poly Land Use Inventory 2017	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Good	1,654	90%	1,248	81%
Fair	171	9%	275	18%
Poor	11	1%	13	1%
Total Housing Units	1,836	100%	1,536	100%

Source: City of Guadalupe, 2019 - 2027 Housing Element; City of Guadalupe, 2017 Background Report, Figure 6-1.

2.4.3 Housing Tenure

Housing tenure, or the split between owner-occupied and renter-occupied housing units, is an important indicator of the housing market. Communities need an adequate supply of units for both rental and purchase in order to accommodate a range of households with varying incomes, family sizes and composition, needs, and lifestyles. Table 2-17 shows that the share of owner-occupied housing units in Guadalupe has consistently hovered near 50 percent of the total housing stock since 2000 with an ever so slight a downward trend in recent years. The share of renter-occupied units depicted a consistent upward trend from 43 percent toward 50 percent over the previous two decades. Vacancy rates remained very low throughout the period, with an all-time low of no vacancies in 2010, reflecting a tight housing market in the region.

Table 2-17: Trends in Housing Tenure of Occupied Units - Guadalupe, 2000 to 2020

Housing Type	2000		2010		2015		2017		2020	
Occupied housing units	1,432	98%	1,888	100%	1,837	97%	1,944	98%	1,912	96%
Owner-occupied	803	55%	955	51%	920	49%	975	49%	909	46%
Renter-occupied	629	43%	933	49%	917	48%	969	49%	1,003	50%
Vacant housing units	36	2%	0	0%	59	3%	39	2%	81	4%
Total Units	1,468	100%	1,888	100%	1,896	100%	1,983	100%	1,993	100%

Source: U.S Census Bureau, DEC SF2, Table DP1, 2000; U.S Census Bureau, DEC SF1, Table H003, 2000; U.S Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP04; U.S Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP04; U.S Census Bureau, 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP04; U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP04.

2.4.4 Vacancy

Housing vacancy rate depicts the relationship between housing supply and demand. For example, if the demand for housing is greater than the available supply, then the vacancy rate would be very low, and the price of housing could most likely increase. A low overall vacancy rate that indicates high demand and short supply of housing may result in overcrowding and ultimately unsafe, unsanitary, or otherwise

unsuitable accommodations. When low vacancy results in high prices of homes and rentals, the effect is most severe on lower income households, people on fixed incomes, families with children, and other special-need groups. Housing discrimination could occur when the rental vacancy rate is low.

The vacancy rate also indicates whether a community has an adequate housing supply to provide choice and mobility. The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) indicates that a vacancy rate of 5 percent is enough to provide choice and mobility. Table 2-17 shows that the highest vacancy rate in Guadalupe over the previous two decades was 4 percent in 2020. During the housing market crash in the 2000s, the vacancy rate dropped to 0 percent in 2010. The data reveal that the City has been typically below the recommended vacancy rate of 5 percent, which would indicate that Guadalupe residents have limited housing choice and mobility and could be susceptible to the adverse conditions associated with low vacancy rates.


2.4.5 Housing Cost

A major barrier to housing availability is the cost of housing. That is why State Law expressly requires cities to plan for a variety of housing opportunities at various prices that are suitable and affordable to various income groups in the community. Figure 2-2 shows that the median home value in Guadalupe more than doubled from \$112,800 in 2000 to \$270,100 in 2010 but retreated to \$203,100 in 2015. Since 2015, the median home price has increased drastically to \$304,400 in 2020. Over two decades, home values increased at an average annual rate of 8 percent compared to 4 percent for household incomes. This implies increasing pressure from housing expenditure on households over time.

While home prices over the period increased overall, historically the median sale price in Guadalupe has been substantially lower than the median sales prices for the neighboring areas. Table 2-18 compares home values in Guadalupe with neighboring communities, the County and the State from 2000 to 2020. The data confirms that Guadalupe traditionally had lower housing cost than its neighbors.

The median rent in Guadalupe was \$1,212 per month for all types of rental housing in 2020. Table 2-19 shows the distribution of rental units by contract rent payments in 2020. This compares favorably to 30 percent of the City's median income at \$1,720. The fact remains that approximately half of all households in Guadalupe who earn below the median income would be hard pressed to afford the median rent in the City. Comparably, 30 percent of median income in the County of Santa Barbara was \$2,121 per month, but rents are much higher in the region outside Guadalupe.

Figure 2-2: Median Household Income vs. Median Home Value – Guadalupe City, 2000-2020



Sources: Median Home Values –U.S Census Bureau, DEC SF3, Table DP3, 2000; U.S Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP03; U.S Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP03; U.S Census Bureau, 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP03; U.S Census Bureau, 2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP03.

Median Household Incomes –U.S Census Bureau, DEC SF3, Table DP4, 2000; U.S Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25109; U.S Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25109; U.S Census Bureau, 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25109; U.S Census Bureau, 2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25109.

Table 2-18: Comparative Median Home Values - Santa Barbara County and Cities, 2000 to 2020

Jurisdiction	2000	2010	2015	2017	2020
State of California	211,500	458,500	385,500	443,400	538,500
Santa Barbara County	293,000	576,500	465,300	509,400	610,300
Goleta	425,700	-	-	-	813,000
Buellton	269,500	561,100	574,600	458,600	580,100
Carpinteria City	382,400	669,200	203,100	617,000	711,100
Santa Maria City	145,600	338,800		297,200	359,700
Lompoc City	148,300	330,600	262,200	269,100	337,100
Guadalupe City	112,800	270,100	230,500	221,400	304,400

Source: U.S Census Bureau, DEC SF3, Table DP4, 2000; U.S Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25109; U.S Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25109; U.S Census Bureau, 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25109; U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25109

Table 2-19: Distribution of Contract Rent Payments - Guadalupe City, 2020

Value	Number	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Less than \$500	44	4%	4%
\$500 to \$999	231	23%	27%
\$1,000 to \$1,499	530	53%	80%
\$1,500 to \$1,999	149	15%	95%
\$2,000 to \$2,499	41	4%	99%
\$2,500 to \$2,999	0	0%	99%
\$3,000 or more	0	0%	99%
No rent paid	8	1%	100%
Total	1,003	100%	
Total Median Gross Rent		1,212	
Total Median Contract Rent		1,049	
2-bedroom Apartment		1,163	
30% City's Median Income		1,720	

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP04; U.S Census Bureau, 2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25058; U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25031.

2.4.6 Affordability and Overpayment

Housing is typically the largest single item of recurrent expenditure for California families. According to HCD criteria, housing is affordable when a household spends less than 30 percent of its gross income on rental or ownership. When a household spends 30 percent or more of its gross income on housing, it is classified as cost-burdened or “overpaying”.

Table 2-20 shows the distributions of households by income range, expenditure, and tenure. The data reveals that over half of all renters in Guadalupe overpaid for housing while nearly one fifth of owners overpaid in 2020. In absolute numbers, more than three times as many renters as owners were cost-burdened. It is also noteworthy that the population of renters fell disproportionately in the lower income categories compared to the population of owners.

Table 2-20: Percent of Household Income Spent on Housing – Guadalupe City, 2020

Tenure	Household Income Range					Total	
	Less than \$10,000	\$10,000 to \$34,999	\$35,000 to \$49,999	\$50,000 to \$74,999	\$75,000 or more	Count	Percent of Households
<i>Owner – Occupied Units</i>							
Less than 30 percent	12	107	51	70	502	742	82%
30 percent or more	16	59	16	76	0	167	18%
Not computed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Total	28	166	67	146	502	909	100%
<i>Renter – Occupied Units</i>							
Less than 30 percent	0	0	81	159	172	412	41%
30 percent or more	58	352	102	64	0	576	57%
Not computed	7	0	8	0	0	15	1%
Total	65	352	191	223	172	1,003	100%

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25074; U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25095.

2.4.7 Overcrowding

Limited household incomes, high housing prices, and inadequate sizes of units within a community trigger overcrowding. The U.S Census Bureau considers a housing unit to be overcrowded when there is more than one person per room, excluding bathrooms and kitchens. Severe overcrowding occurs when a unit has more than 1.5 occupants per room. Overcrowding can result when there are not enough adequately sized housing units within a community, or when high housing costs, relative to income, force too many individuals or families to share housing. Overcrowding can also accelerate deterioration of the housing stock.

Table 2-21 shows that overcrowding is more prevalent in Guadalupe than in Santa Barbara County as a whole. In 2020, 8 percent of owner households in the City lived under overcrowded conditions compared to three percent of owner residents in the County. There were more than double the levels of overcrowding among renters with 19 percent and 8 percent in the City and County, respectively. Therefore, by tenure, renter units were more crowded than owner units. This suggests the need for larger and more affordable rental units in the City.

Table 2-21: Overcrowding - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020

Household Type	Guadalupe City		Santa Barbara County	
	Households	Percent	Households	Percent
<i>Owner Occupied</i>	909	48%	77,504	52%
Overcrowded	102	5%	2,631	2%
Severely Overcrowded	49	3%	1,199	1%
<i>Renter Occupied</i>	1,003	52%	70,805	48%
Overcrowded	252	13%	6,979	5%
Severely Overcrowded	112	6%	4,525	3%
Total Households	1,912	100%	148,309	100%

Note:

1. *Overcrowded is when there is more than 1 person per room*
2. *Severely overcrowded is when there are more than 1.5 persons per room*

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25014.

2.4.8 Conclusion

The City's housing stock is largely in good condition; however, one third of the housing stock is more than 20 years old, which might require more regular maintenance and repair. Since 2000, housing prices in the City have increased at a faster pace than household incomes. As a result, nearly half of all households in the City spent approximately a third or more of their incomes on housing with the cost burden more common among renters than owners. The numbers of households that can comfortably afford the median priced home in the City and the numbers that can afford the median priced apartment have declined since 2000. All these findings point to the need for more affordable housing in the future. Programs to assist moderate-income first-time buyers and lower-income renters could help narrow the affordability gap. Chapter 3 includes a list of potential funding sources and programs.

2.5 Special Housing Needs

Special circumstances make it difficult for certain groups to find decent, affordable housing. The circumstances may relate to type of employment and income, family characteristics, disability, or other limiting conditions. Those who fall into these circumstances would have a “special need” for housing. Those with certain specific demographic characteristics such as large families with low incomes, for instance, might need housing units with three or more bedrooms that they can afford. Those in such special occupational groups as seasonal farm workers might need single-room occupancy units. Analysis of special needs housing can help a municipality identify groups with the most serious housing needs in order to develop and prioritize programs to respond to those needs. State law specifically requires analysis of the special housing needs of the elderly, large families, female-headed households, persons with disabilities, farmworkers, homeless persons and families, and extremely low-income households. Chapters 3 and 4 further discuss housing resources and constraints to housing provision.

2.5.1 Elderly

Fixed incomes, high health care costs, and physical disabilities are three typical circumstances that categorize some senior households for special housing need. Table 2-22 shows the trend in senior-headed households in Guadalupe from 2000 to 2020. Senior households have kept pace with other

households growing from 302 in 2000 to 329 in 2020 thereby maintaining a similar, but slightly declining share from 21 percent of all households in 2000 to 17 percent in 2020. The share of senior-headed households in Guadalupe was lower than Santa Barbara County, which had 41,284 senior-headed households, (or 28 percent of all households) in 2020.

Table 2-22: Households by Age of Householder - Guadalupe City, 2000 to 2020

Age of Householder	2000		2010		2015		2020	
	Households	%	Households	%	Households	%	Households	%
Up to 64 years	1,130	79%	1,615	86%	1,522	83%	1,583	83%
65 years+	302	21%	273	14%	315	17%	329	17%
Total	1,432	100%	1,888	100%	1,837	100%	1,912	100%

Source: U.S Census Bureau, DEC SF3, Table H014, 2000; U.S Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25007; U.S Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25007; U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25007.

Table 2-23 shows the distribution of householders by tenure in Guadalupe in 2020. At 11 percent, senior-headed households make up one of the smallest shares among renters; and with 36 percent, senior-headed households make up the single largest share among homeowners. Because senior citizens are on fixed incomes, they particularly tend to need affordable housing, especially if homes become too costly to maintain or if rents increase. Some senior citizens who do not rent or own housing can share housing with other family members. For instance, some elderly parents could live with their adult children or in other shared arrangements which could result in overcrowding.

Table 2-23: Householder by Tenure and Age - Guadalupe City, 2020

Age of Householder	Renter Occupied		Owner Occupied		All Tenure	
	Households	Percent	Households	Percent	Households	Percent
15 to 24	16	2%	0	0%	16	1%
25 to 34	295	28%	38	4%	333	16%
35 to 44	325	31%	130	13%	455	22%
45 to 54	211	20%	147	14%	358	17%
55 to 64	77	7%	344	34%	421	20%
65 and over	119	11%	363	36%	482	23%
Total	1,043	100%	1,022	100%	2,065	100%

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25007.

Elderly persons may also have additional physical and social needs particularly if: (a) they have no immediate family; (b) lack mobility through physical impairment; (c) or lack access to transportation alternatives. Such needs may include transportation, social service referrals, financial assistance, employment, long-term care for the home-bound, and day care.

It behooves long-range planning to recognize elderly persons' needs and design programs to address them. Various organizations and programs that can assist seniors with their housing needs in Guadalupe

include supportive services, rental subsidies, senior housing, and housing rehabilitation assistance. The Guadalupe Senior Citizens Center offers many programs for senior residents. The nutrition program serves lunch at the community center every day and delivers meals to homebound seniors who are unable to walk or drive to the center. The Club provides transportation to doctors' visits and shopping. A health nurse comes in regularly to check blood pressure and general health. Bread and perishable staples are available weekly while commodities are distributed once a month free of charge to seniors who want them.

The Central Coast Commission for Senior Citizens has compiled a directory of services available for elderly persons in Santa Barbara County. Some of the services include adult education, financial planning services, health facilities such as home nursing and mental health care, and recreation and community interaction programs.

To address elderly housing needs, the City could require developers to design housing units that are accessible to all persons, regardless of physical ability. Units should also be affordable for seniors who are on fixed incomes.

2.5.2 Large Households

The U.S Census Bureau defines large households as those comprising five or more persons. These households may have special housing needs because there is often a limited supply of adequately sized, affordable housing units in communities. Large units generally cost more than smaller units pushing them out of the affordability range. To cover expenditure on such necessities as food and health care, it is common for large lower-income households to reside in smaller (more affordable) units, which frequently results in overcrowding. It is important, therefore, that there is both adequate supply and affordability of large units for large households in Guadalupe.

Table 2-24 shows the distribution of occupied housing units by number of rooms and tenure in 2020. It reveals that approximately 80 percent of rental units and approximately 80 percent of owner units have four to six rooms, which would seem to be predominantly family-friendly. However, large families need at least as many rooms as there are persons in the household to prevent living in overcrowded conditions. In 2020, large units of five or more rooms made up approximately 40 percent of renter units and 85 percent of owner units. The large units were not necessarily affordable as there were two times as many large owner units as renter units. This would explain the overcrowding noted in Table 2-21.

Table 2-25 shows the distribution of occupied housing units by number of persons and tenure for 2020 which provides further insight into the potential for overcrowding. Households with five or more persons occupied 40 percent of renter units and 35 percent of owner units. While the share of large renter units matched the share of large households, the share of large owner units far outstrips the share of large households suggesting affordability issues with owner units for large families.

To address overcrowding and adequately supply large households with suitable housing, the City can offer incentives to facilitate the development of large housing units with four or more bedrooms. A shortage of large units can be alleviated through inclusionary zoning and community partnerships with entities such as People's Self-Help Housing, Habitat for Humanity, and other affordable housing

developers that offer opportunities for affordable housing ownership. Funding sources such as the first-time homebuyer program and Community Development Block Grant program can help move renters to home ownership. Chapter 3 discusses resources for general financial assistance which may be available to large households.

Table 2-24: Number of Rooms per Occupied Housing Unit by Tenure – Guadalupe City, 2020

Number of Rooms	Renter Occupied		Owner Occupied		All Tenure	
	Housing Units	Percent	Housing Units	Percent	Housing Units	Percent
1 Room	41	4%	13	1%	54	3%
2 Rooms	28	3%	0	0%	28	1%
3 Rooms	94	9%	12	1%	106	6%
4 Rooms	406	40%	104	11%	510	27%
5 Rooms	241	24%	412	45%	653	34%
6 Rooms	143	14%	199	22%	342	18%
7 Rooms	19	2%	93	10%	112	6%
8 Rooms	0	0%	22	2%	22	1%
9 Rooms or more	31	3%	54	6%	85	4%
Total	1,003	100%	909	100%	1,912	100%

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25020.

Table 2-25: Number of Persons per Occupied Housing Unit by Tenure - Guadalupe City, 2020

Number of Rooms	Renter Occupied		Owner Occupied		All Tenure	
	Housing Units	Percent	Housing Units	Percent	Housing Units	Percent
1 Person	109	11%	157	17%	266	14%
2 Persons	153	15%	140	15%	293	15%
3 Persons	171	17%	138	15%	309	16%
4 Persons	171	17%	159	17%	330	17%
5 Persons	203	20%	137	15%	340	18%
6 Persons	98	10%	107	12%	205	11%
7 Persons or more	98	10%	71	8%	169	9%
Total	1,003	100%	909	100%	1,912	100%

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25009.

2.5.3 Female Headed Households

Single-parent households, particularly female-headed households, often require special consideration and assistance with affordable housing, accessible day care, health care, and other supportive services. Because of relatively lower incomes and higher living expenses, female-headed households tend to have limited opportunities for affordable, decent, and safe housing. These households become particularly vulnerable as they try to balance the needs of their children with responsibilities of work.

Table 2-26 shows the distribution of household types in Guadalupe by tenure in 2020. Comparing unmarried households, there were nearly twice as many female-headed households as male-headed households in the City. Table 2-27 reveals that the burden of single-parenting fell disproportionately on women with 76 percent of these households looking after one or more persons under age 18 years. A third of unmarried female householders also had care-taking responsibilities for persons aged 60 years and over.

From the perspective of tenure, there were three times as many female-headed households in renter units as in owner units. This has implications for the incomes of female-headed households and the availability of affordable units to suit their needs. In 2020, 25 percent of female-headed households lived below the poverty level.

Table 2-26: Occupied Housing Units by Household Type by Tenure - Guadalupe City, 2020

Number of Rooms	Renter Occupied		Owner Occupied		All Tenure	
	Housing Units	Percent	Housing Units	Percent	Housing Units	Percent
Married Couple Family	448	45%	601	66%	1,049	55%
Male Householder, no spouse present	152	15%	73	8%	225	12%
Female Householder, no spouse present	272	27%	78	9%	350	18%
Nonfamily Householders	131	13%	157	17%	288	15%
Total	1,003	100%	909	100%	1,912	100%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S2501.

The Boys and Girls Club is a resource for female-headed households with children. This organization has a branch in Guadalupe where it offers many programs and opportunities for children and young adults. The River View townhomes also provide low-income housing and includes a community center, health clinic, learning center, and education assistance to children and adults.

In addition, the federal Aid for Dependent Children program (AFDC) provides support for the children in single-parent families. Depending on household income, single-parent family households may also qualify for other federal housing assistance programs, such as Section 8 vouchers (also called housing choice vouchers), which subsidize the balance of the rental cost in excess of 30 percent of the renter's gross income. The program enables the prospective tenant to use the subsidy in the private marketplace in search for rental housing. To further address the housing needs of female-headed households, the City should promote the development of additional multifamily housing.

Table 2-27: Comparative Characteristics of Householders - Guadalupe City, 2020

Household Type	One or more people under 18 years		One or more people aged 60 years and over		Income in the past 12 months below poverty level	
	Housing Units	Percent	Housing Units	Percent	Housing Units	Percent
Married Couple Family	732	70%	283	27%	149	14%
Male Householder, no spouse present	112	50%	62	28%	75	33%
Female Householder, no spouse present	267	76%	110	31%	88	25%
Nonfamily Householders	14	5%	150	52%	-	-
All Household Types	1,125	-	605	-	312	-

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1101; U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B17013.

2.5.4 Persons with Disabilities

A disability is a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits major life activities. Persons with disabilities tend to have special housing needs in the form of affordable housing because of low or fixed incomes, higher health costs associated with their disabilities, and special requirements for mobility. Table 2-28 shows the distribution of the disability population in Guadalupe among the six groups that the U.S Census identifies. Census data for 2020 revealed that the incidence of disability in Guadalupe cuts across gender, age, and race. City-wide, 8 percent of the population had one or more of the six disability types. The two most prevalent forms of disability in 2020 were: (a) ambulatory and (b) an independent living disability, which both occurred disproportionately among seniors.

The living arrangements for persons with disabilities depend on the type and severity of the disability. Many disabled persons can live at home in an independent environment with or without the help of other family members. To maintain independent living, disabled persons may require assistance, which may include special design features for the physically disabled, income support for those who are unable to work, and in-home care for persons with medical conditions. These services are available through public or private agencies.

Table 2-28: Population with Disability - Guadalupe City, 2020

Type of Disability	Disability Population	Percentage of Total Civilian Population
With hearing difficulty	127	1.7%
With vision difficult	93	1.2%
With a cognitive difficulty	166	2.2%
With an ambulatory difficulty	334	4.4%
With a self-care difficulty	89	1.2%
With an independent living difficulty	189	2.5%
Subtotal Disability Population	610	8.0%
Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population	7,654	100%

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1810.

In 1984, Title 24 of the State Uniform Building Code mandated that all multiple-family residential projects containing more than five units and constructed after September 15, 1985 conform to specific disabled, adaptability, and accessibility regulations. In 1988, the Federal government enacted the U.S Fair Housing Amendment Act with the intent to increase the number of rental units being built that would be accessible to individuals with disabilities. In July 1993, the State of California issued the "California Multifamily Access Requirements" based upon the Act. However, despite these regulatory changes, the actual increase in the number of accessible units available in the rental market has remained small. Even though Federal and State housing laws require certain design features or adaptation of housing design for physical accessibility in multifamily residential buildings, many dwelling units built before March 1991 are not subject to these accessibility requirements. There is a need therefore to adapt houses or apartments for wheelchairs and other special requirements for individuals with physical disabilities. Requiring adaptive design features in new construction, for example, does not assist such individuals as seniors who may choose to remain in older housing rather than move to assisted living facilities or other newly constructed housing. A good planning consideration to suit persons with physical disabilities is to locate new housing units in proximity to services and public transportation.

The Tri-Counties Regional Center provides support and services for individuals with developmental disabilities living in the counties of San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara and Ventura. The agency documents individuals who receive services from the Tri-Counties Regional Center including those from Guadalupe.

Persons with mental disabilities are a critically under-served population with respect to housing. The physical modification of housing is typically not necessary to accommodate mentally disabled persons, but they generally require more services and more monetary support. The mentally disabled tend to have limited opportunities for jobs and incomes making affordable housing important for them. Many mentally disabled persons would prefer to live independently, but because of monetary circumstances, they are compelled to live with other family members or in group homes. This may cause additional stress and problems. In some cases, the need for a resident assistant to help deal with crisis or challenging situations may also create special housing demand. This would suggest that there is a need for some apartment or condominium complexes that are reserved exclusively for persons requiring

extra assistance in dealing with their daily routines. However, Guadalupe may be too small for such apartments, which are typically found in large cities. Because many mentally handicapped persons are unable to drive, access to public transportation for these residents is also important. There are a limited number of day treatment facilities and programs in Guadalupe, which include drop-in socialization centers to serve persons with mental disabilities. These individuals do not have regional centers as do the persons with physical disabilities and there is no respite care for families who provide round-the-clock care for relatives with mental disabilities.

2.5.5 Farmworkers

The definition of “farmworker” is a person who earns primary income through permanent or seasonal agricultural labor. Permanent farm laborers work year-round in the fields, processing plants, or support activities. When workload increases during harvest periods, employers of seasonal workers supplement the labor force often through a labor contractor. For some crops, farms may hire migrant workers, that is, those whose travels prevent them from returning to their primary residence every evening.

It has been problematic estimating the size of the agricultural labor force as the U.S Census and other data sources undercounted or mis-classified farmworkers. For instance, the government agencies that track farm labor are not consistent in the definitions of related terms. *Farm labor* sometimes includes only field laborers and other times includes workers in plants that process farm produce. Length of employment sometimes includes only permanent workers and other times includes seasonal workers. *Place of work* sometimes refers to the location of the business, but other times it refers to the field.

The 2011 Census reported that there were approximately 12,094 farmworkers in Santa Barbara County and 590 in the City of Guadalupe. The 2020 Census reported approximately 18,824 in Santa Barbara County and 1,186 in the City of Guadalupe. This equals 35 percent of all employed persons in the City. In addition, The U.S. Census of Agriculture (Ag Census) estimates that farms and ranches across Santa Barbara County hired 22,985 laborers in 2007, a 6 percent increase over a 10-year period. According to the Ag Census, while the number of hired farm laborers increased, the number of farms decreased by 8 percent since 2012. Table 2-29 shows the top ten agricultural products in Santa Barbara County and are listed by rank of annual revenue in 2020.

Table 2-29: Top 10 Agriculture Products by Rank - Santa Barbara County, 2018 and 2020

Crop	Value	2018 Rank	2020 Rank
Strawberries	\$1,643,241,000	1	1
Cauliflower	\$109,282,000	6	2
Broccoli	\$104,654,000	5	3
Nursery Products	\$98,567,000	3	4
Wine Grapes	\$93,836,000	2	5
Avocado	\$80,161,000	9	6
Lettuce, leaf	\$78,084,000	8	7
Lettuce, head	\$74,298,000	7	8
Celery	\$61,688,000	-	9
Blackberries	\$46,560,000	-	10

Source: Santa Barbara County, Agricultural Production Report, 2020; <https://www.countyofsb.org/469/Crop-Reports>.

Table 2-30 shows the distributions of the total employed populations in Guadalupe and Santa Barbara County in 2020. The Agriculture Industry was the single largest employer of Guadalupe residents making up 35 percent of the employed in the City and 9 percent of the employed in the County. In 2020, the concentration of agricultural workers in Guadalupe (35 percent of all jobs) was three times the concentration of such workers in the County (9 percent of all jobs). This reflects the importance of farmworkers in the City. Using the 2017 U.S Census of Agriculture for the County and applying the share of those employed in Agriculture would yield an upper estimate of 1,448 farmworkers in Guadalupe. This would include both permanent and temporary workers in agriculture within the year. Since historically farmworkers are among the lowest earning categories of workers, many farmworkers are likely to fall into the lower income groupings for housing affordability.

The scale and type of agricultural production in the County and the sector's importance to both the local and State economies suggest the need for decent and sanitary housing options for farmworkers. Seasonal and migrant farmworkers tend to save as much of their earnings as possible for repatriation to their countries of origin to support families. This often leads migrant farmworkers to seek the lowest-cost alternatives for housing during their stay. This further exacerbates the need for housing that is affordable to farmworkers. Given the importance of agriculture and its labor force, the provision of adequate farmworker housing is a critical issue for Guadalupe as many of these workers are believed to live in poor housing conditions and face the problems of overpayment or overcrowding.

An effective means to address the housing needs of the City's farmworker population is to facilitate development of new rental housing that is affordable to low and very low-income households. This should include both single and multiple room units. The City previously approved the Guadalupe Court affordable housing project, which included 38 extremely low, very low, and low-income rental housing units. The City also has several programs in place to increase affordable housing. Examples of such programs include density bonuses for subdivisions that include an affordable housing component and ongoing pursuit of state and federal funds to assist in the development of affordable housing.

Table 2-30: Estimates of Farmworker Population - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020

Industry	Guadalupe City		Santa Barbara County	
	Guadalupe City	Percent of City	Santa Barbara County	Percent of County
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	1,186	35%	18,824	9%
Construction	110	3%	11,534	5%
Manufacturing	178	5%	14,778	7%
Wholesale trade	183	5%	4,291	2%
Retail trade	333	10%	20,694	10%
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	40	1%	6,430	3%
Information	36	1%	4,161	2%
Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing	163	5%	9,998	5%
Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services	226	7%	25,068	12%
Educational services, and health care and social assistance	590	17%	49,005	23%
Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services	136	4%	26,135	12%
Other services, except public administration	139	4%	11,684	6%
Public administration	73	2%	9,149	4%
Civilian Employed Population 16 Years and Over	3,393	100%	211,751	100%
2017 U.S Census of Agriculture Farm Workers	1,448 ¹		22,985	
Percent of County Employed in Agriculture	6%		100%	
Agriculture as Share of Ag. Forestry ... Mining	122%		122%	

Note:

1. *Guadalupe City estimate = Santa Barbara County 2017 Farmworkers total of 22,985 * 0.06*

Sources: U.S Census Bureau, 2017 & 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP03; U.S Census of Agriculture, 2017 Census Volume 1, Chapter 2: County Level Data, Table 7.

2.5.6 Unhoused

Unhoused persons are individuals who lack regular nighttime residence possibly due to limited or lack of regular income. Some of them need short-term, temporary, or emergency shelter probably due to immediate crisis while others have long-term or chronic needs. The unhoused population represents a broad spectrum of the population including single men and women, couples, families, displaced youth without parents, and seniors. They can include individuals who are victims of economic dislocation, the physically disabled, teen parents with children, veterans, those discharged from hospital or jail, alcohol and drug abusers, survivors of domestic violence, persons with HIV AIDS, immigrants, refugees, and farmworkers.

According to the Guadalupe Police Department, there were rarely any unhoused persons in the City. The County of Santa Barbara conducted a count of unhoused people in the County in 2022. While the survey

counted 1,962 people in the County, less than one percent lived in Montecito, Guadalupe, Orcutt, and the Santa Ynez Valley combined. In the past, unhoused persons have been transient farmworkers who had not yet found a place to live, but they did not remain unsheltered over extended periods of time. Most transient workers were able to afford some form of shelter when they gained employment, but often under overcrowded or otherwise inadequate conditions.

The rare occurrence of homelessness in Guadalupe does not call for an emergency shelter or transitional housing facility, however, such a facility is permitted by right in areas zoned R-3 for residential uses. Chapter 4 further discusses this issue under constraints to housing development. There are social services and year-round shelters for the unhoused at locations in Santa Maria and Santa Barbara. The Santa Barbara County Housing Authority has an office location in Guadalupe to provide public housing assistance. The City also meets and coordinates with other government agencies and community groups to address homelessness.

2.5.7 Extremely Low-Income Households

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) defines “extremely low-income” households as those earning up to 30 percent of area median income (AMI). In 2020, Santa Barbara County had a median income of 84,846. Households earning up to \$25,453 would therefore fall into the classification of extremely low-income households. Table 2-13 reveals that households in Guadalupe fall predominantly in the lower income categories with 60 percent in those “lower-income” categories compared to 40 percent in the “upper-income” categories. About 18 percent of total households in Guadalupe fell into the extremely low-income category. These households (among others) depict a variety of housing situations and needs when they face overpayment, overcrowding, and substandard housing conditions. Other families and individuals receiving public assistance in the form of social security insurance (SSI) or disability insurance tend to fall into the category of extremely low-income households.

One way to address the housing needs of those in the extremely low-income category is to facilitate development of single and multiple room rental housing, as well as supportive rental housing linked to a range of support services. Supportive housing can help residents to maintain stable housing and lead productive lives. Services may include childcare, after-school tutoring, and career counseling, among others. The River View and the Guadalupe Court affordable housing developments in Guadalupe offer supportive services to their residents.

2.5.8 Persons with Developmental Disabilities

The presence of developmental disability is mild, but nevertheless present among the population of GUADALUPE. As of December 2021, the Department of Developmental Services recorded 95 cases in the City, which equated to a rate of nearly twelve per thousand population. Among the cases, a little more than half (55%) were minors below age 18 while the remainder were adults of 18 years old or above. Table 2-31 has details. As far as type of care, persons with developmental disability receive care overwhelmingly (95%) from the homes of parents, family, or guardians. Therefore, issues of housing availability and choice relate primarily to care-givers rather than the subjects.

Available resources include HUD Section 811 Grants to non-profit developers of supportive housing for persons with disabilities, including group homes, independent living facilities and intermediate care facilities. The special needs housing resources in the City include accommodations for persons with disabilities for whom there are day programs for the youth and a senior center for the elderly.

Table 2-31: Distribution of Persons with Developmental Disabilities – Guadalupe, 2021

Developmental Disability by Type of Care	Count	Percent of Cases	Percent of Population
Home of Parent /Family /Guardian	90	95%	1.12%
Independent /Supported Living	<11	5%	0.06%
Community Care Facility	0	0%	0.00%
Intermediate Care Facility	0	0%	0.00%
Foster /Family Home	0	0%	0.00%
Total Residents	>90	100%	1.18%
Developmental Disability by Age Group			
Minors (00-17 years old)	52	55%	0.65%
Adults (18+ years old)	43	45%	0.53%
Total All Ages	95	100%	1.18%
Rate of developmental Disability (per 1000 population)	11.82		
Total Population of Guadalupe, 2021	8,039		100%

Source: Department of Developmental Services. (December, 2021).
<https://www.dds.ca.gov/transparency/facts-stats/>.

2.6 Assisted Housing At-Risk of Conversion

This section identifies all residential projects in Guadalupe that are under an affordability covenant, along with those housing projects that are at-risk of losing their low-income affordability restrictions within the eight-year period from 2023 to 2031. This information is used to establish quantified objectives for units that can be conserved during this planning period. The inventory includes all units assisted under any federal, state, or local program.

2.6.1 Inventory of Potential At-Risk Units

Table 2-32 is an inventory of developments within Guadalupe which participate in federal, state, or local programs that provide some form of assistance either through financial subsidy or control.

Table 2-32: Inventory of Assisted Affordable Housing Developments - Guadalupe City, 2020

Project Name	Address	Year	Number of Units	Authority	Program	Covenant Expires
Escalante Tract (Guadalupe Ranch Acres)	1050 Escalante Drive	1975	80	Housing Authority of the County of Santa Barbara	Apartment complex rents to low-income families. Rent is based on a percentage of the family's income.	Permanent
Guadalupe Ranch Senior Apartments	4561 Tenth Street	1975	56	Housing Authority of the County of Santa Barbara	Apartment for elderly low-income residents.	Permanent
Riverview Townhomes	230 Calle Cesar Chavez	2003	80	People's Self-Help Housing	80 affordable rental units, 39 of which are for farmworkers; includes a community center, health, clinic, and learning center.	Permanent
Point Sal Dunes	Point Sal Dunes Way	2000	18	Housing Authority of the County of Santa Barbara	Provides 18 mortgage subsidies for the low-income residents. Units have a 30-year deed restriction that limits the resale price of these units to the average increase in median income in the County.	2030
Guadalupe Court	11th Street	2014	38	People's Self-Help Housing	38 affordable rental units for farmworkers	2070

Source: Housing Authority of the County of Santa Barbara, 2022; Affordable Housing Online, 2022.

2.6.2 Risk of Conversion

According to the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority and City data, 7 percent or 18 of the 272 total assisted units in the City would be at risk of converting to market rate in 2030, near the end of the 2023-2031 time period. Dwelling units at Point Sal Dunes primarily comprise: (a) single-family homes of medium-size (three or four bedroom) units and smaller-size (studio, one-bedroom, and two bedroom) units, as well as (b) units in small apartment buildings. Most of the units are occupied by a mixture of

owners and renters including the assisted units. Guadalupe could consider reinstating the covenant for the assisted Point Sal Dunes units at the end of its term in 2030 and modifying it to become permanent as most of the other assisted units are in the City.

The average construction cost of a good quality multifamily apartment averaged approximately \$65 to \$75 per square foot in 2015, which would reflect the original unit costs of the assisted units at Point Sal Dunes. Comparatively, the 80 units of newly re-constructed affordable apartments at the Escalante Meadows Apartments cost a total of \$18,238,141. This converts to averages of \$227,980 per unit (excluding the cost of land) and \$200 per square foot in 2023. Similarly, a 1200 square-foot, 5-year-old, single family home in the Pasadera development sold in March 2024 (according to Zillow) for \$579,000 or \$483 per square foot in Guadalupe reflecting the prevailing costs of market rate housing. These comparative construction cost data suggest that the purchase and dedication of the deed-restricted units at Point Sal Dunes (which were restricted to the average increase in median income in the County) to make them permanent assisted units is bound to cost far less than building new replacement units.

The following analysis illustrates this assertion. The primary factors used to analyze the cost of preserving low-income housing include:

1. Acquisition costs depend on size, location, and current sale prices. However, the assisted units at Point Sal Dunes were deed-restricted to the average increase in median income in the County, which rose by about 17 percent from \$72,761 in 2015 to \$84,846 in 2021.
2. New construction costs depend on size of unit, quality and cost of construction materials, financing costs, as well as off-site and on-site improvement costs. However, the assisted units at Point Sal Dunes completed construction by 2015 when construction costs were approximately a third of today's costs for similar affordable units.
3. Rental assistance depends on the income of the household and Fair Market rents. Neighborhood Scout (<https://www.neighborhoodscout.com/>) estimates current average rent in the Point Sal Dunes development as \$2,764. Based on state income limits, a very-low-income household of four persons could afford to pay \$1,601 per month (including a utility allowance) for housing. This would require a monthly rental subsidy of \$1,163, or \$13,956 per year for an average unit. Therefore, if affordability covenants were to expire on the units of the at-risk project, a total cost of approximately \$14,000 per year would be required to provide rental subsidies for each assisted unit.

Replacement through new construction would be very difficult due to the scarcity and high cost of buildable land. New construction is bound to be approximately three times as high as the original costs of the at-risk units while acquisition cost would be under 25 percent higher than the original costs of the at-risk units. Besides, the rental subsidies would shoot up to \$14,000 per year if affordability covenants were to expire on the at-risk units. It is therefore more prudent and far less costly for the Housing Authority of the County of Santa Barbara to acquire the assisted units at the deed-restricted prices and make them permanently affordable.

2.7 Future Growth Needs

In accordance with State law, this section provides a quantification of Guadalupe's share of the regional housing need as established in the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) prepared by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG).

2.7.1 Overview of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation

The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process is a key planning tool for local governments to anticipate and prepare for future housing need. RHNA quantifies the anticipated need for housing within each jurisdiction based on regional population forecasts of the California Department of Finance. Communities within specific regions determine collaboratively how to share the need and address it in updates to the housing elements of general plans.

SBCAG has the responsibility of preparing the RHNA for the incorporated and unincorporated communities within Santa Barbara County, which includes the City of Guadalupe. The most current RHNA was adopted in July 2021 and covers a period from February 2023 through February 2031. SBCAG applied the following methodology to allocate housing units to each jurisdiction:

- SBCAG estimated the future population within each jurisdiction based upon State Department of Finance projections and knowledge of circumstances particular to Santa Barbara County.
- SBCAG converted the change in population into housing units necessary to accommodate increases in population. The estimate included a vacancy rate that reflects a "healthy" housing market that would enable movement of households among units and replacement of existing units that may become demolished.
- SBCAG divided the estimate of housing needs into four groups based on income categories labelled as very low, low, moderate, and above moderate income. This step is to target enough quantity of housing for all income groups in the community.
- The "very low" category is subdivided in this document to show the "extremely low" (ELI) as a fifth category. HCD recommends that the projected housing need for ELI households be calculated either by using available census data to determine the number of very low-income households that qualify as ELI households or by presuming that 50 percent of the regional housing need allocation (RHNA) for very low-income households qualify as ELI households.
- The process first allocates housing needs for each jurisdiction based on the percentage of households that falls into each category. For instance, if 15 percent of households fall under the low-income category then 15 percent of future housing needs should be affordable to households within that income category.
- The process then adjusted allocations according to such factors that may be particular to each jurisdiction as disproportionate housing types, number of renters, number of persons receiving public assistance, employment patterns, commuting patterns, and avoidance of over-impaction of low-income households.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) (Steinberg, 2008) and Senate Bill 575 (Steinberg, 2009) affect the RHNA process and the 5th and 6th Housing Element cycles in several ways. The main changes include: (a) the integration of the RHNA process with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Sustainable Communities

Strategy (SCS); (b) requirement for coordination and consistency of the housing element with the RTP and SCS; and (c) the length of the housing element cycle. The sixth cycle for the Santa Barbara County region covers an eight-year planning horizon (February, 2023 to February, 2031). The City of Guadalupe was previously on a 4-year update cycle due to a late submittal of a previous update to the Housing Element although each update continued to plan for an eight-year horizon.

Table 2-32 compares the shares of households in five income categories in 2020 with the adjusted shares of SBCAG's RHNA allocations for the 2023-2031 period. While the RHNA allocation indicates a split of 6 percent to the lower income categories and 94 percent to the upper income categories, a more substantial 60 percent of households fell into the lower-income and 40 percent of households fell into the upper-income categories in 2020. Table 2-13 shows what would be equivalent allocations based solely on shares of households in various income categories as is the practice with many RHNA processes. SBCAG adjusted the percentages to account for special circumstances. At any rate, Guadalupe needs to plan for a substantial proportion of affordable housing to meet the needs of lower income households.

Table 2-32: Shares of Households vs. RHNA Allocations by Income Groups - Guadalupe City, 2020

Income Group	2020 Shares of Households by Income Group			Allocations	
	Income Range	Households	Percent of Households	Hypothetical Equivalent Units	2023-2031 RHNA Units
Extremely Low	< \$23,678	347	18%	78	1
Very low	\$24,467 - \$39,463	468	24%	106	2
Low	\$40,252 - \$63,140	365	19%	82	24
Moderate	\$63,929 - \$94,710	276	14%	62	77
Above Moderate	> \$95,499	456	24%	103	327
Civilian Employed Population 16 Years and Over	-	1,912	100%	431	431

Sources: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1901; Santa Barbara County Association of Governments, Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan, 2023-2031.

SBCAG projects a total need of 431 new housing units in Guadalupe across various income categories over the eight-year planning period. RHNA suggests Guadalupe needs to increase its supply of housing units for above moderate-income households to meet the needs of the region.

3.0 Resources for Residential Development

3.01 Introduction

This chapter discusses opportunities and resources for housing development in Guadalupe. A summary of additional information in subsequent sections of this document indicates that the City has sufficient sites with the appropriate zoning to meet the City’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the eight-year planning period of the 6th Cycle. Many of the available opportunity sites are vacant while others have structures for conversion to combinations of commercial and residential mixed-uses. The section includes illustrations from recent development activities to demonstrate that the sites can realistically accommodate specified numbers of units.

The Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) made an allocation of housing units to Guadalupe for the new 6th Cycle. The prior (5th Cycle) Housing Element identified opportunities for new housing units of which most of the small sites are still available to be carried forward. While there are new requirements to account for the successful use of sites identified in the previous cycle, many more opportunities for housing emerged from the updated 2042 General Plan, which increased the capacity for housing substantially beyond the City’s allocation for the 6th Cycle.

Guidelines require the analysis of housing sites to be comprehensive and realistic and to include both properties zoned for residential uses as well as those that are zoned to allow the combination of residential and commercial uses. Sites, therefore, include those that are vacant, non-vacant but underutilized, or non-vacant but convertible to mixed uses. Then there are assumptions for accessory dwelling units (ADUs), which are essential in achieving the supply of affordable housing vis-à-vis an acute shortage of affordable housing in the State.

The identification of suitable sites followed guidelines of the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) with input from City officials in the planning, building, and development areas of the local government. Typical factors for consideration are: such physical features as slope, hazards, and type of vegetation; availability of transportation infrastructure and accessibility; lot size, use, ownership, and zoning; proximity to services and transit; and the value and extent of improvements on each site. The inventory from the 5th Cycle provided an initial dataset for update with new construction activity and new opportunities for residential space.

3.02 State Requirements for the Site Inventory

The State has guidelines for identifying housing opportunity sites. Some of the guidelines were in effect for the 5th Cycle, but many are new for the 6th Cycle. The following subsections highlight the guidelines.

3.02.1 Default Densities

In accordance with AB 2348, sites deemed suitable for lower income households must be zoned at densities of at least 30 units per acre. This is referred to as the “default density.” Despite trying to maintain its “small-town” character, Guadalupe’s revised zoning for 2019 (Ch 18.35) allows housing densities up to 30 dwelling units per acre in mixed-use areas.

3.02.2 Realistic Capacity

Guidelines require jurisdictions to estimate the number of housing units according to a “realistic” capacity rather than a “theoretical capacity” of the site. For instance, a site zoned for 40 units per acre, may not be able to accommodate all 40 units on an acre due to such topographical and physical features as steep slopes, wetlands, and creeks. There may also be limitations on lot coverage, height and other attributes of development that could make it difficult to achieve the maximum density zoned for the area. Guidelines also require that cities may not count the potential for density bonuses in the estimation of realistic capacities even if it is routine that projects are awarded such bonuses.

Development potential of sites depends generally on the residential density standards of the City. Consideration of whether site constraints and land use controls can achieve the permitted densities help in refining the estimates of housing capacities. The process involves the following steps:

1. In general, the acreage of the parcel was first multiplied by the allowable density, unlike the more restrictive minimum lot area per unit set forth in the Zoning Code.
2. Any fractional component on the number of units allowed under the density standards was dropped.
3. The application of density bonuses was not included in the calculation of allowable units; rather, the allowable base land use density was used.
4. The conduct of a parcel-by-parcel evaluation of any unusual site characteristics or land use controls led to further downward adjustments to the allowable number of residential units if additional constraints to development existed. Constraints that in some cases resulted in lower residential development potential included right-of-way for road access, irregular lot shapes, difficulty in meeting minimum roadway frontage requirements, and existence of wetlands or drainage courses on the parcel. Such constraints typically had enough of an effect to result in reduced residential capacity on some of the available lots.
5. Adherence to this methodology provided a conservative residential capacity that took into consideration any special or unusual circumstances and therefore is more realistic than a simple multiplication of lot size and density.

Instead of “theoretical capacity”, therefore, recent development activity can provide data for the estimation of “realistic capacity”. Such information can also demonstrate the feasibility of relatively small lots in accommodating housing units. In Guadalupe, information on recent development activity indicates that many recently approved and constructed projects are meeting or slightly exceeding the theoretical zoned densities. Section 3.03 presents the illustrative examples.

3.02.3 Carry-Over Sites

Assembly Bill (AB) 1397 of 2017 introduced new requirements for re-counting housing sites that were identified in previous Housing Elements. This was in response to concerns that cities were simply carrying the same sites forward from cycle to cycle without either creating incentives for development or providing evidence on feasibility of the sites for housing development. The new requirements intend to promote incentives that would encourage the development of the sites identified in specific cycles.

Under State law, “carry-over” sites must be zoned no less than three years into the planning period, which is February 15, 2026 for jurisdictions in Santa Barbara County, with a designation that allows “by right” approval for projects in which at least 20 percent of the units are affordable to lower income households. “By right” approval means that the City cannot require permits for Planned Unit Development, Conditional Use Permit, or other forms of local discretionary review. The City may require design review with public hearings as long as adopted standards are objective. The City of Guadalupe established “by-right” approval provisions in its zoning for multi-family districts particularly when accommodating groups with the special housing needs described in Chapter 2. Additionally, It is noteworthy that housing development in the DJ Farms Specific Plan Area into the Pasadera housing neighborhood during the 5th Cycle dominated housing over-production in the City of Guadalupe so that most of the previous vacant sites scattered within the community remain to accommodate housing need within the 6th Cycle and beyond.

3.02.4 Special Requirements for Sites Designated to meet Lower-Income Needs

Since 2015, additional legislation and guidelines from HCD have established further requirements for sites designated as suitable to meet a city’s housing needs for those in the lower income groups. More specifically, Government Code 65583.2(h) requires that each site designated for lower-income housing has the capacity for at least 16 units. This emanates from the realization that development of affordable housing usually requires large numbers of units per project to be economically feasible.

The State has also established that sites smaller than 0.5 acres or larger than 10 acres are typically not feasible for lower-income housing. These limitations do not prohibit the designation of such sites in a city’s inventory, but they do require jurisdictions to prove that the sites can be developed for affordable housing based on past trends and actual projects. In Guadalupe, the Alvarez West Apartments and the Escalante Meadows Apartments are on lot sizes that are between 1 acre and 9 acres in size.

3.02.5 Non-Vacant Sites and the “Substantial Evidence” Requirement

Cities that rely on non-vacant sites to meet 50% or more of their lower income RHNA are subject to a requirement to provide “substantial evidence” that the sites are realistic and developable. Examples of substantial evidence include expiring leases, buildings in poor condition, uses with extremely low improvement values (such as parking lots), and property owners who are interested in developing the parcels. Another aspect of substantial evidence is whether nearby parcels with the same physical characteristics have recently been developed (or approved for development) at the presumed densities.

Guadalupe is not subject to the “substantial evidence” requirement since it is able to meet the assigned lower-income allocations without development of non-vacant sites. However, the City has potential for additional lower-income housing units in its downtown mixed-use area beyond the 6th Cycle.

When it becomes necessary to count the units in the non-vacant sites downtown for future cycles the City should include findings in the resolution adopting the Housing Element that existing uses do not impede additional residential development as required by Government Code § 65583.2(g)(2). The City

plans to offer incentives, like fast-tracking of development applications, to property owners and developers for eventual development of non-vacant sites downtown.

3.02.6 Reporting of Sites by Income Category

Guidelines require cities to identify sites by income category. For reporting purposes, low- and very low-income sites may be added together and described as “lower-income” sites. Individual sites can accommodate housing for multiple income categories. For instance, large sites that are subject to the City’s inclusionary housing ordinance would serve a mixture of low, moderate, and above moderate-income groups by including “above moderate income” units, while some of the units would serve “lower” income needs. Similarly, certain high-density housing for market-rate rentals could also be “affordable by design” to accommodate moderate income households, for instance, in the form of studio apartments. Tables in Appendix B identify affordability levels of housing on various sites.

3.02.7 Buffer and No Net Loss Requirements

Senate Bill (SB) 166 requires that cities include a “buffer” of additional sites in case some of the sites listed in the Housing Element become unavailable before 2031. HCD requires the buffer to be at least 15 percent and encourages even higher buffers. In general, the more a community relies on non-vacant sites to meet its RHNA, the higher the buffer should be. Based on the 2042 General Plan, Guadalupe has designated sufficient space to accommodate 874 units which equates to approximately double its RHNA of 431 units across all income groups. Considering the developments already in the pipeline or under construction, Guadalupe is poised to produce 678 units within the 6th Cycle, which is more than a 55 percent buffer for the total housing need. The potential for ADUs are additional to this buffer.

SB 166 also includes a requirement for “no net loss” under which cities must demonstrate that they have adequate sites to meet RHNA units at all times during the planning period. If a project on a housing site proposes a smaller number of lower income units than was presumed in the Housing Element, the City must determine that it has adequate capacity on the remaining opportunity sites to meet its RHNA. If the City is no longer able to meet its RHNA, it must identify a developable “replacement” site to make up the lost capacity. In some cities, this could require rezoning. The risk of a net loss is extremely low in Guadalupe given its historic mix and trajectory of housing development.

3.02.8 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Requirements

The inventory of sites is subject to the requirements of AB 686 on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH). Guidelines require the geographical distribution of sites for lower-income housing to foster integration and create affordable housing opportunities throughout high resource areas. The entire City of Guadalupe falls within a low resource zone while the community is economically disadvantaged. In meeting requirements for AFFH, lower-income sites must not cluster away from sites for other income groups. **The historical distribution of housing in the City depicts spreading of multiple income types across the community. The Housing Element acknowledges this phenomenon and encourages the distribution of affordable housing throughout various neighborhoods in the City. Encouragements include allowing Accessory Dwellings in single family neighborhoods and promoting duplexes, SB 9 lot splits, or lot consolidations elsewhere to enable construction of multi-family units.**

3.02.9 SB 9 Lot Split and Duplex Requirements

Senate Bill (SB) 9, *The California Housing Opportunity and More Efficiency (HOME) Act*, became State law in 2021 to facilitate small-scale, multiple housing development in single-family residential zones. The law allows a homeowner with a single-family lot to divide the lot into two smaller lots. Each of the two small lots can accommodate two housing units (or a duplex) for a total of four units on the original lot. The law allows ministerial approval which enables staff to approve the lot split or additional unit thereby bypassing the regular review process through the Planning Commission, as long as the change complies with objective design and development standards. Conditions for approval include the following:

- a maximum of four units on a single-family residential parcel;
- does not include historic and landmark districts;
- retains local control since homeowners must comply with local zoning requirements for height, floor area ratios, lot coverage, etc. that do not physically preclude lot splits or duplexes;
- allows locals to require a percolation test for any duplex proposed to be on septic tanks;
- the lot must be in a jurisdiction that is part of an urbanized area or urban cluster as designated by the US Census in order to promote strategic infill growth;
- does not include lots in very high fire hazard severity zones, prime agriculture lands, hazardous waste sites, earthquake zones, floodplains that do not have adequate mitigation, and similar other lands with restrictions.

The City's code on subdivision requires a letter of intent followed by a conference with City officials. Historically, developers have requested lot consolidations or the subdivision of large parcels but not the splitting of individual building lots. Program 1.9 addresses the need to update the code to reflect the requirements under SB 9 to further foster the production of affordable housing.

3.03 Evidence to Support Estimates of Realistic Capacity of Parcels

The information in this subsection covers three recent multi-family projects in Guadalupe, one occupied, and two under construction. These examples can help address HCD requirements to determine if there are generally any prohibitions to site development which would reduce the density of housing projects.

Alvarez West 11th Street Apartments (occupied)

These 12 units were constructed on 0.61 acres with the R-3 zoning (20 units per acres at the time of approval). Maximum theoretical density was 12 units, which the developer achieved. On-site parking included six covered and 10 uncovered spaces, which exceeded parking requirements at the time of approval. The zoning ordinance required a minimum of 10 percent landscaping, which the developer exceeded. This site's density has been maximized with 12 units.

Alvarez East 11th Street (under construction)

This project, currently under construction, is for 20 apartment units plus 2 ADUs located on 1.08 acres. The zoning was changed from R-1 to R-3 (20 units per acre) as part of the approval for the project. New parking standards were in effect at the time the units were approved. The developer is providing 45 on-site parking spaces where 20 are required to be covered (i.e., one per unit, excluding ADUs).

Landscaping is proposed to occupy 11 percent of the site. Parking and drive isles will take 26% of the project site. This site's density has been maximized with 22 units.

Escalante Meadows La Guardia Street (under construction)

This project is a redevelopment of a previous Section 8 housing site where there were 52 single story units on 8.96 acres. The property, zoned R-2, was approved in 2020 when the density was 14.5 units per acre. At 8.96 acres, there could have been 129 theoretical units, but the developer chose to build 80 units in ten separate residential buildings. The developer's desire to have a very large community center (20,000 sq. ft.) and ample landscaping (34 percent), reduced the total number of units that could be built. The site also contained wetlands which had to be avoided, so an additional 10 percent of the site was undevelopable, although that land contributed to the theoretical maximum density. The developer was also required to meet the new parking requirements of two spaces per unit with one covered unit. They provided 192 spaces with 80 covered sites. The project will provide all low and very low-income units. **Its location is highly accessible as it is within a walking distance (six blocks or approximately half a mile) from the downtown core. In addition, there is a proposed transit bus stop right in front of the development to provide extended access not only to the rest of the City, but also to the nearest major urban center, the City of Santa Maria.**

3.1 Land Availability

Government Code Section 65583(a)(3) requires the Housing Element to contain "an inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites and sites having the potential for redevelopment, and an analysis of the relationship of zoning and public facilities and services to these sites." Appendix B contains a detailed analysis of vacant land and potential development opportunities. The following paragraphs summarize the results of the analysis.

The most recent Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for Santa Barbara County covers the eight-year planning horizon from 2023 to 2031. Consistent with this length of planning horizon, this 2023-2031 housing element for Guadalupe adopts the City's share of the regional housing need of 431 units. Consistent with the City's 2042 General Plan, the housing element focuses on the development potential of vacant land zoned for residential uses (infill sites), underdeveloped General-Commercial sites that could accommodate mixed use development in the City's Central Business District, and the DJ Farms Specific Plan area. Sites that are zoned R-3, Multiple Dwelling Residential (high density), would allow a density of up to 26 dwelling units per acre and are most appropriate for new housing for lower income households. R-3 zoned parcels are located on both sides of State Highway 1 to the north, east, and west of Guadalupe's downtown commercial core. Downtown extends from Sixth Street to Twelfth Street. There are many parcels within this area that are either vacant or could be redeveloped with projects that would exceed 20 units/acre to accommodate 50 or more units. Additionally, the DJ Farms Specific Plan area includes 44-acres that are zoned RSL-14, which would allow higher density residential development and up to 322 dwelling units.

Development potential depends on the residential density standards of the City. Consideration of whether site constraints and land use controls can achieve the permitted densities help in refining the estimates of housing capacities. In general, the acreage of the parcel was first multiplied by the allowable density, unlike the more restrictive minimum lot area per unit set forth in the Zoning Code. Any fractional component on the number of units allowed under the density standards was dropped. The application of density bonuses was not included in the calculation of allowable units; rather, the allowable base land use density was used. The conduct of a parcel-by-parcel evaluation of any unusual site characteristics or land use controls led to further downward adjustments to the allowable number of residential units if additional constraints to development existed. Constraints that in some cases resulted in lower residential development potential included right-of-way for road access, irregular lot shapes, difficulty in meeting minimum roadway frontage requirements, and existence of wetlands or drainage courses on the parcel. Such constraints had enough of an effect to result in reduced residential capacity on some of the available lots. Adherence to this methodology provided a conservative residential capacity that took into consideration any special or unusual circumstances.

Although in many cases, lot consolidation could result in a larger percentage of buildable area and a higher number of housing units, this methodology to calculate development potential did not take this possibility into account. It should be noted, however, that there are opportunities for lot consolidation, particularly in the City's Central Business District. For example, development of multiple contiguous parcels has occurred in Guadalupe with the Ruiz Apartments project on Olivera Street and the Dune Villas project on Eleventh Street. The following paragraph further illustrates other examples of land consolidation.

In the past, development projects on lots zoned for multi-family residential (R-3) uses have been approved or developed at a density of 20-units per acre in Guadalupe. Examples of this include residential projects such as the 74-unit La Plaza Villas at 736-754 Olivera Street (built in 2006), the 7-unit Dune Villas project at 4623 Eleventh Street (approved in May 2006, with an extension of the tract map granted until 2010), the 38-unit Guadalupe Court (approved October 14, 2014), and the 34-unit Pioneer Street Apartments project.

3.1.1 Vacant Residential Parcels

The California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo conducted a Land Use Inventory in 2017 as part of the update to the General Plan and Land Use Element. As of September 30, 2017, the City had one hundred and thirty vacant parcels. The largest parcel was the DJ Farms Specific Plan Area, now known as Pasadera Homes. Besides the DJ Farms Specific Plan Area, there were 10.12 acres of other vacant residential lands within City limits. Based on the residential densities in the Zoning Code and Land Use Element, and as further evaluated for site and planning constraints in Table B-1 in Appendix B, Table 3-1 indicates that the 10.12 acres of vacant residential land can conservatively accommodate approximately **102 units**, which would more than satisfy Guadalupe's 27 very low and low income RHNA units. Then there is residential development potential at the DJ Farms Specific Plan area which can accommodate Guadalupe's moderate and above moderate RHNA units. Additionally, there is potential for additional housing in the residential/commercial mixed-use area of downtown.

As stated in the 2042 General Plan, DJ Farms has 363 existing dwelling units according to the Guadalupe Building Department. A total of 740 dwelling units were authorized for the site as of 2022. The difference of **377 units** are to be developed on approximately 31.5 acres of land at an average density of 12.0 dwelling units per acre.

Development potential for the mixed-use designation assumed that all new development would accommodate commercial activities on the ground-floor and residential uses on the second floor. Residential potential applied 25.5 dwelling units per acre (which is the midpoint of the allowable density for the High-Density Residential designation to the single-story square footage to estimate the potential for **35 additional dwelling units**.

Together, these potentials for additional housing would exceed the short-term RHNA allocations for the 2023-2031 cycle. Besides, the 2042 General Plan has also identified additional acreage for residential development in the long term to a grand total of 874 units.

Table 3-1: Capacity of Vacant Residential Land Exclusive of DJ Farms Specific Plan Area

Zoning	Vacant Land (acres)	Allowable Density (units per acre)	Realistic Capacity (housing units)
R-1, R-1-5P	4.56	6	23
R-1-M, R-1-M-SP	0.37	10	0
R-2, R-2-5P	1.03	10	10
R-3	4.16	20	69
Total	10.12	-	102

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, 2017; City of Guadalupe 2042 General Plan; City of Guadalupe Zoning Code

Appendix B includes an analysis of the suitability of vacant parcels for residential development. All high-density vacant sites were less than half an acre in size except one; and all except four sites were less than one-third of an acre in size. It is also notable that the City's updated General Plan has policies and programs that promote the consolidation of small lots, which would be expected to result in larger unit production potentials for consolidated properties. In addition, the Planned Residential Development Overlay provides for flexibility in design and allows modifications to base zoning district development standards to provide for more efficient utilization of housing sites to generate additional housing units.

The City has been active in facilitating development of smaller lots to produce affordable housing projects. City support for such affordable housing projects is primarily through the application of the Planned Development overlay district, which provides for flexibility with respect to density, on-site parking requirements, and other design standards. Historically, the City has utilized reductions in water meter connection fees and the negotiation of development agreements as additional tools to promote affordable housing. For instance, the City worked directly with Cabrillo Economic Development

Corporation to approve in October 2014 a 38-unit multi-family affordable housing project on 3.12 acres located at 4202 11th Street.

3.1.2 Mixed Use Development

Parcels zoned “General-Commercial” in the City's Central Business District allow for mixed use development and would provide additional housing opportunities including those for lower income residents. The Santa Barbara County Assessor's data revealed 26.86 acres of commercially zoned land in the Central Business District that could accommodate mixed use development.

Maximum building intensity standards in the Land Use Element of the City’s General Plan and zoning code allow for a floor-to-area ratio (FAR) of 0.35. Assuming 20 percent buildout potential of sites zoned for general commercial use, the acreage could yield 54,874 square feet of residential development or 35 dwelling units (at approximately 1570 square feet of average unit size) . Table B-3 in Appendix B includes details of the estimates. Although lot consolidation could provide increased residential capacity the estimate included no assumptions on lot consolidation. The housing element does not include potential housing in the mixed-use downtown in achieving the City’s RHNA.

3.1.3 DJ Farms Specific Plan Area

The DJ Farms Specific Plan Area covers 209 acres of land providing ample opportunities for both market-rate and affordable residential development. The Plan area is in the southeastern section of the City south of West Main Street/State Route 166 and east of Highway 1. The Specific Plan was adopted in 2012 and called for residential development on 146 acres of the Plan area for up to 802 housing units. As of August 2022, about 363 units were built with approval for construction of 377 more. The remaining 65 acres are to be developed into commercial uses, open space and parks, and a school. Table 3-2 shows the housing capacity of Pasadera. Even in the absence of infill development elsewhere in the City, developing the remainder of the approved housing in the DJ farms Specific Plan area would accommodate most of the 431 RHNA units.

Table 3-2: Housing Capacity of DJ Farms Specific Plan Area

Density	Land Available (acres)	Allowable Density	Realistic Capacity (housing units)
Very Low	4.6	6 units/acre	15
Low	25.4	7 units/acre	108
Medium	71.4	8 units/acre	357
High	44.6	14 units/acre	322
Total	146		802

Source: Revised DJ Farm Specific Plan, August 2012.

Additional factors that can increase the potential for housing (but not specifically evaluated) include: (a) development of accessory (or secondary) dwelling units (also called granny units); (b) redevelopment of

underdeveloped parcels that were not built to full allowable density; and (c) General Plan updates and zoning code amendments to increase intensity in strategic areas of the City. While Guadalupe can meet its housing allocation without exercising these other options, they present additional opportunities for expansion of housing and affordable housing in the City beyond the 6th Cycle.

3.2 Financial Resources

Financing is available for infrastructure and housing improvements through Federal, State, and local programs. The following subsections identify certain programs.

3.2.1 Federal and State Resources

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program – Federal funding for housing is available through the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The CDBG program is flexible, allowing use of funds for a wide range of activities. The eligible activities include, but are not limited to, acquisition or disposition of real estate or property, public facilities and improvements, relocation, rehabilitation and construction of housing with certain limitations, homeownership assistance, and clearance activities. The City continues to apply for CDBG funds toward rehabilitation of public facilities.

Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program – The Tax Reform Act of 1986 created the low-income Housing Tax Credit Program to provide an alternate method of funding low-income and moderate-income housing. Each state receives a tax credit based on population to fund housing that meets program guidelines. The tax credits typically leverage private capital into new construction or acquisition and rehabilitation of affordable housing. Limitations on projects funded under the Tax Credit programs include requirements that rent is restricted by median income on certain minimum percentages of units.

Other Federal and State Resources -Table 3-3 summarizes additional funding sources that can assist extremely low, very low, low, and moderate-income households or developers of affordable housing. Many of these funding sources are typically eligible for specific types of projects and may not be secure. However, they do offer opportunities to facilitate affordable and adequate housing.

Table 3-3: Additional Federal, State, and Private Financial Resources

Program	Description	Eligible Activities
<i>Federal Resources</i>		
HUD Section 202	Forgivable loans to non-profit developers of supportive housing for the elderly	Site acquisitions, rehabilitation, new construction
HUD Section 203(k)	Long-term, low interest loans at fixed rate to finance acquisition and rehabilitation of single-family homes	Site acquisitions, rehabilitation, new construction
HUD Section 811	Grants to non-profit developers of supportive housing for persons with disabilities, including group homes, independent living facilities and intermediate care facilities	Site acquisitions, rehabilitation, new construction, rental assistance

Program	Description	Eligible Activities
U.S Department of Agriculture (USDA), Rural Development Service's Section 514 Farm Labor Housing Program	Below market-rate loans for farmworker rental housing	Site acquisitions, rehabilitation, new construction
U.S Department of Agriculture (USDA), Rural Development Service's Section 514 Rural Rental Housing Program	Below market-rate loans for low and very low-income rental housing	Rental assistance
USDA Rural Development Section 504 Housing Repair and Rehabilitation Program	Loans and grants to repair and rehabilitate the homes for low-income families and seniors	Rehabilitation
USDA Rural Development Section 533 Housing Preservation Grant (HGP) Program	Grants to nonprofit and government agencies to fund housing rehabilitation programs for low-income households	Rehabilitation
Section 8	Rental assistance program which provides a subsidy to very low-income families, individuals, seniors, and disabled people. Participants pay a percentage of their adjusted income toward rent	Rental assistance
HOME	Grant program intended to expand the supply of decent and safe affordable housing. HOME is designed as a partnership program between the federal, state, local governments, non-profit and for-profit housing entities to finance build/rehabilitate, and manage housing for lower income owners and renters	Rehabilitation, administration
ACCESS and National Homebuyers Fund (NHF) Gold Programs	ACCESS and NHF are second loan programs for down payments assistance. Allows low and moderate-income homebuyers to pay for down payment and closing costs up to 7% of the sales price	Down payment assistance
233(f) Mortgage Insurance for Purchase/Refinance	Mortgage insurance for purchase or refinance of existing multifamily projects	New rental housing operation, administration, acquisition
241(a) Rehabilitation Loans for Multifamily Projects	Provides mortgage insurance for improvements repairs, or additions to multi-family projects	Rehab of apartments, energy conservation
Congregate Housing Services Program	Provides grants to public agency or private non-profit to provide meal services and other supportive services to frail elderly and disabled residents in federally assisted housing. Also supports remodeling to meet physical needs	Grants
HOPE 3- Homeownership of Single-Family Homes	Program provides grants to State and local governments and non-profit organizations to assist low-income, first-time homebuyers in	Grants

Program	Description	Eligible Activities
	becoming homeowners by utilizing government owned or finances single-family properties	
HOPE 6- Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing	Provides funds for revitalization, demolition and disposition of severely distressed public housing for Section 8 tenant-based assistance	Grants, rent subsidies
HOPE II- Homeownership for Multifamily Housing	Provides grants to develop programs allowing mostly low-income families to purchase units in multifamily housing projects owned, finances or insured by HU or other federal, state, or local public agencies	Grants
Sec. 202 Supportive Housing for Elderly	Provides capital grants and operation subsidies for supportive housing for elderly	Rent subsidies, construction, rehabilitation
<i>State Resources</i>		
CaliHome	Provides grants to local governments and non-profit agencies for owner occupied rehabilitation programs and new home development projects	Site acquisition, rehabilitation
CalHFA Rental Housing Programs	Provides below market rate financing offered to builders and developers of multifamily and elderly rental housing. Tax exempt bonds provide below-market mortgages	Site acquisitions, rehabilitation, new construction
Self-help Builder Assistance Program (SHBAP)	State lower interest rate CalHFA loans to owner-builders who participate in self-help housing projects sponsored by non-profit housing developers	Site acquisitions, rehabilitation, new construction, home buyers' assistance
Multifamily Housing Program (MHP)	State deferred-payment loans	Rehabilitation, new construction, rental housing, supportive housing for disabled
Multifamily Housing Program (MHP) Supportive Housing Allocation	MHP loans for supportive housing for special needs populations	Supportive housing
Joe Serna Jr. Farmworker Housing Grant Program (JSJPWHG)	Provides grants and loans to local governments and nonprofit housing developers for farmworker housing	New construction, acquisition, migrant housing, housing with related health services
Weatherization Assistance Program	Grants from California Department of Community Services and Development to improve the energy efficiency of homes occupied by low-income households to reduce their heating and cooling costs	Improvements
Mobile Home Park Resident Ownership Programs (MPROP)	Loans from California Department of Housing and Community Development for the purchase	Mobile homes

Program	Description	Eligible Activities
	of mobile home parks by local governments, nonprofit corporations, or residents	
California Self-Help Housing Program (CSHHP)	Grants from the California Department of Housing and Community Development for the administrative costs of self-help or owner-builder housing projects	Administration, new construction
Predevelopment Loan Program (PDLP)	Short-term loans from the California Department of Housing and Community Development for the construction, rehabilitation, conversion, or preservation of affordable housing projects	Rehabilitation of apartments, acquisition, preservation of affordable housing, new rental housing
Special Needs Affordable Housing Lending Program	All multifamily projects that serve at-risk tenants in need of special services	Rehabilitation of apartments, acquisition, new rental housing
<i>Private Resources</i>		
Federal Home Loan Bank (FHLB) Affordable Housing Program	Provides competitive grants and subsidized loans to create affordable rental and homeownership opportunities	New construction, new rental housing
Access to Housing and Economic Assistance for Development (AHEAD) Program	Recoverable grants from the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco to support housing projects during the conception and early stages of development	New construction, new rental housing
Community Investment Program (CIP)	Funds from the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco to finance first-time homebuyer programs, create and maintain affordable housing, and support other community economic development activities	Homebuyer assistance
Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae)	A variety of homebuyer assistance, rehab assistance, and minority homeownership assistance	Homebuyer assistance, rehabilitation, minority homeownership assistance
California Community Reinvestment Corporation (CCRC)	Nonprofit mortgage banking consortium that pools resources to reduce lender risk in finance of affordable housing. Provides long term debt financing for affordable multifamily rental housing	New construction, rehabilitation, acquisition
Community Reinvestment Act Loan Program	Provides real estate construction financing, small business loans, and consumer loans	Acquisition loans, business loans, predevelopment or interim finance, construction or rehabilitation loans

Program	Description	Eligible Activities
Vision Forward	To provide affordable housing to low-income residents throughout the U.S	Acquisition loans, construction or rehabilitation loans, down payment assistance
Affordable Housing Programs	Provides grants or subsidies interest rate loans for purchase, construction, or rehabilitation of owner-occupied housing by or for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households or to finance the purchase, construction or rehabilitation of rental housing	Construction or rehabilitation loans, grants, long-term loans, technical assistance

3.2.2 Local Resources

Guadalupe Redevelopment Agency (RDA) – As of February 1, 2012, the statewide dissolution of all Redevelopment Agencies ceased this local resource for funding affordable housing and redevelopment projects in Guadalupe. However, “redevelopment” remains a viable approach to housing development and renewal of blighted area.

Santa Barbara County Housing Authority – This Housing Authority provides rental housing and supportive services to eligible persons with limited incomes through a variety of programs. The agency develops and manages housing for low-income households; it administers federal Section 8 rental housing assistance programs in the private rental market; and it offers a HUD-certified comprehensive counseling agency that serves homeowners and renters. The Santa Barbara County Housing Authority owns and manages the Escalante tract, a 58-unit affordable housing rental development built in 1975 in northeastern Guadalupe.

Peoples' Self-Help Housing Corporation (PSHHC) – PSHHC is a housing and community development corporation that serves the counties of San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura. PSHHC helps low-income individuals, families, senior citizens and developmentally disabled individuals to obtain affordable housing. PSHHC also offers first-time homebuyers an opportunity to build their own homes in lieu of down payments as was the case with the 50 affordable homes in the River View development in Guadalupe. PSHHC also owns and manages the 80 affordable River View Townhomes in the City, which opened in 2003.

Habitat for Humanity – Habitat for Humanity is a non-profit organization dedicated to building affordable housing and rehabilitating damaged homes for lower income families. The agency builds homes with the help of volunteers and partner-families who may be homeowners and sells to partner families at no profit with affordable, no-interest loans. The City provided Habitat for Humanity three separate affordable housing sites: one on the 800 block of Pioneer Street, one on Twelfth Street between Olivera Street and Pacheco Street, and the third on the 1100 block of Pacheco Street. All three of these housing sites are relatively small lots that range from 5,000 square feet to 7,500 square feet and the anticipation is to develop each exclusively for affordable housing.

Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation (CEDC) – CEDC received approval for the Guadalupe Court affordable housing project in 2014. The project includes 37 multi-family residential units and 1 manager unit located at 4202 11th Street in Guadalupe. The project includes: a mixture of one-bedroom, two-bedroom, and three-bedroom units; a community center; and common open space. The units are restricted to being affordable and available to families in need of affordable housing. People’s Self-Help Housing Corporation (PSHHC) assumed the development of the former CEDC property and began construction in early 2019. The project is now completed and fully occupied.

4.0 Constraints

The Government Code prescribes that the Housing Element addresses constraints to housing production and availability (Gov. Code §65583(a)(5) and (6)). Governmental constraints impact housing costs and supply as well as certainty with the housing market via controls on use of land, codes and enforcement, requirements for on-site and off-site improvements, fees and exactions, processing and permit procedures, and guidelines for housing production to suit persons with disabilities.

Non-governmental constraints are primarily market-driven and generally outside direct government control, but jurisdictions can influence and offset the negative impacts of nongovernmental constraints through responsive programs and policies. This group of constraints include land prices, construction costs, and availability of financing. The following sections analyze various constraints to housing.

4.1 Governmental Constraints

Governmental regulations intend to control development for the health, safety, and welfare of the community, but can also unintentionally increase the costs of development and consequently the cost of housing. The following subsections describe potential governmental constraints, which could affect the supply and cost of housing in Guadalupe.

4.1.0 Transparency of Zoning, Development Standards, and Fees

In compliance with new transparency requirements for the posting of all zoning, development standards, and fees, the City's website contains all of these items for easy public access. Table D-1 under Appendix D, for instance, shows the full list of the schedule of fees which is accessible online.

Further, all development standards, contained within the zoning ordinance, are available within the City's website. To ease access, the links to the development standards occur in multiple locations as users browse for various topics.

4.1.1 Land Use Controls

4.1.1.1 General Plan

State law requires each city and county in California to prepare a long-term, comprehensive plan to guide its growth and future development. The Land Use Element of the General Plan establishes the basic land uses and density of development within the various areas of the City. Under State law, the elements of the General Plan must be internally consistent, and the City's zoning must be consistent with the General Plan. The Land Use Element must therefore provide suitable locations and densities to implement the policies of the Housing Element.

The City adopted an updated General Plan in November 2022. The Guadalupe 2042 General Plan covers a comprehensive set of required and optional elements. Table 4-1 shows the residential land use designations in the Land Use Element, which include low density, medium density, and high-density housing in addition to mixed-use. The residential land use categories can accommodate a variety of housing types and styles and can assure a diversity and mixture of housing types throughout the City.

Table 4-1: Guadalupe General Plan Residential Land Use Designations

Land Use Designation	Density	Housing Type
Low Density Residential	Up to 12 units per gross acre	Detached single-family housing, group homes with six (6) or fewer residents, accessory dwelling units
Medium Density Residential	13-20 units per gross acre	Single-family homes, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, and townhouses
High Density Residential	21-30 units per gross acre	Apartments, townhouses, similar multiple-family structures, homeless shelters, and group homes of any size
Planned Residential Development	Provides up to 15 percent more housing units per acre in Low and Medium Density Housing Areas ¹	Single-family and multi-family housing units up to the maximum allowed densities in the underlying residential designation
Mixed Use (including housing)	Up to 30 units per gross acre in addition to other compatible uses	Vertical or lateral juxtaposition of such compatible uses as housing (typically in the form of flats), office, and retail. Residences occupy second floors (e.g., above ground-floor non-residential uses) including: 1) single-room occupancies, apartments, and stacked-flat-style condominiums; and 2) attached two- and three-story residences occupying their own sites. This second form of residential use is limited to townhouse-style condominiums, townhouse-style zero-lot-line units, and townhouse-style apartments that are not located on Guadalupe Street north of 7 th Street

Note: 1. In January 2008, the City amended the Zoning Code for a Planned Residential Development Overlay District
 Source: 2042 Guadalupe General Plan, 2022.

The category termed Planned Residential Development is an overlay district that allows increased flexibility in design with relaxed development standards for efficient use of certain housing sites. Specific allowances include deviation from standard setback requirements, removal of minimum or maximum lot size standards, and reduced parking requirements. Development sites seeking this overlay designation must demonstrate to the City Council that the project meets one or more of the following criteria:

- It provides facilities or amenities suited to such special needs groups as the elderly or families with children.
- It transfers allowable development within a site from areas of greater to areas of lower environmental sensitivity or hazard.
- It provides a wider range of housing types and costs than would be possible with development of uniform dwellings throughout the project site or neighborhood.

- Features of the design meet or exceed tenets of conventional standards related to privacy, usable open spaces, adequate parking, compatibility with neighborhood character, and others.
- It incorporates features which can result in lower consumption of materials, energy, or water than conventional development.

The City has three Specific Plan development sites which include River View, Point Sal Dunes, and DJ Farms. Each provides additional guidance on standards for development within the plan area. Where the zoning ordinance and subdivision regulations differ from the Specific Plan, the requirements of the Specific Plan take precedence. Conversely, unless otherwise prescribed by the Specific Plan, the standards and regulations of the underlying zoning district apply. The General Plan and Zoning Ordinance assigns an "SP" suffix to the land use designations and zone districts subject to a Specific Plan. The SP designation is intended to alert developers and property owners that the property is subject to the development standards and other requirements of a Specific Plan.

4.1.1.2 Zoning Designations

The City regulates the type, location, density, and scale of residential development through the Zoning Code. Zoning regulations are tools to implement the General Plan and are designed to protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of residents. The Zoning Code also helps to preserve the character and integrity of existing neighborhoods. The Zoning Code sets forth residential development standards for each zoning district. Table 4-2 shows the five zones that allow residential development by right in Guadalupe.

In addition to the residential zones, four commercial zones permit varying levels of mixed-use and multiple-family residential development as either allowed or conditionally permitted uses. The General-Commercial (G-C) zoning district, for instance, permits single-family or multi-family dwellings if located above a permitted commercial use, but they are subject to a Conditional Use Permit if not associated or mixed with a permitted commercial use (that is, if for instance they are located on a floor above a permitted use). Table 4-2 also shows the commercial zones.

Table 4-2: Residential & Commercial Zoning in Guadalupe

Zoning Code	Density
<i>Residential</i>	
R-1, R-1-SP, and R/N-SP-CZ	Single-Family (Low Density) Residential District
R-1-M and R-1-M-SP	Single-Family (Medium Density) Residential District
R-2 and R-2-SP	Multiple Dwelling (Medium Density) Residential District
R-3	Multiple Dwelling (High Density) Residential District
PD	Planned Development Overlay
<i>Commercial</i>	
MIX	Mixed Use District
C-S	Commercial Service District
G-C	General Commercial District
C-N	Commercial Neighborhood District

Source: City of Guadalupe Zoning Code.

Table 4-3 summarizes the development standards in the City’s zoning regulations. Following recent adoption of the Guadalupe 2042 General Plan, it is expected that the zoning regulations would be updated to synchronize with the densities in the Plan, where necessary. Notwithstanding, the zoning regulations as they stand are compatible with the new General Plan.

Table 4-3: Development Standards in Guadalupe Zoning Code

Zoning Designation	Minimum Lot Size (Sq. Ft.)	Density (units per acre)/ FAR ¹	Setback Requirements (Feet)				Height Limit (feet) ⁴
			Front	Rear	Side	Corner Lot	
R-1	3,630	5	20	15	5	10	35
R-1-M	3,630	10	10	15	5	10	35
R-2	2,178	14	20	15	5	10	35
R-3	1,452	20 ²	20	15	5	10	35
PD ³		9-15					
MIX	None	6	None	None	None	None	50
G-C	None	Not Specified	None	None	None	None	50
C-S	None	Not Specified	None	None	None	None	50
C-N	None	4	None	None	None	None	50

Notes: ¹ FAR is ratio of building floor area (sq ft) to land area (sq ft)

² 1,452 sq. ft. minimum lot size excludes roads, sidewalks, and other infrastructure needs, Gross Density of 25 units per acre established in the Land Use Element

³ Where a planned development (PD) overlay is applied, any standards identified or set in the approved PD shall take precedence; those standards in the underlying zone shall remain in effect.

⁴ Program 6.9 requires an amendment to the municipal code to drop the “two-story” restriction and enable development of three-story structures within the 35-foot height limit in R-1, R-2, and R-3 districts

Source: City of Guadalupe Zoning Code.

Table 4-4 provides a summary of the residential uses permitted under the City's zoning regulations. It is possible to accommodate low-income housing and special needs housing in multiple zones in the City of Guadalupe, provided they meet site-specific development standards.

Table 4-4: Allowed Residential Development by Zone

Housing Types	R-1	R-1-M	R-2	R-3	PD	MIX	G-C	C-S	C-N
Single-Family Detached	P	P	P	P	P				
Single-Family Duplex		P	P	P	P				
Multiple Dwelling			P	P	P	C	P		C
Mobile Homes				C					
Dwelling Groups ¹			C	P ²	P	C	C		C
Farmworker Housing			P	P	P	C	P		C
Care Facilities ⁴	P	P	P	P ²			C		C ³
Single Room Occupancy			P	P	P	P	P		C
Emergency Shelters ⁵	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Transitional Housing ⁵	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Supportive Housing ⁵	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		

Notes: P = Permitted; C = Conditional Use Permit

1. 18.08.100 of the Guadalupe Municipal Code defines "Dwelling groups" as a group of 2 or more detached or semi-detached one-family, two-family, or multiple dwellings occupying a parcel of land in one ownership, and having any yard or court in common, but not including motels, hotels, boardinghouses, or rest homes. [Ord, 189 Art. 7, 1980].
2. Provided that there is no more than one residing occupant for each 500 square feet of land in the lot or parcel on which the use is located.
3. Providing care for six or more persons.
4. Including persons with disabilities
5. *These permitted uses are allowed* in all residential zone districts and shall be subject only to those restrictions that apply to other dwellings of the same type in the same zone

Source: Guadalupe Zoning Code.

4.1.1.3 Zoning for a Variety of Housing Types

4.1.1.3.1 Emergency Shelters, Transitional Housing, and Supportive Housing

In 2007, the State Legislature adopted Senate Bill 2 (SB 2), which requires local governments to identify one or more zoning districts that permit emergency shelters by right in their zoning codes. That means the shelters would not require conditional use permit, which could pose constraints. The law requires jurisdictions to amend zoning codes to allow by right in all residential zoning districts "transitional housing" and "supportive housing" (as defined by the Health and Safety Code Sections 50675.2(h) and 50675.14(b)). SB 2 also specifies that "emergency shelters" (as defined in the Health and Safety Code Section 50801(e)) may only be subject to those development and management standards that apply to residential developments within the same zone except that a local government may apply written, objective standards that include all the following:

- The maximum number of beds or persons permitted to be served nightly by the facility.
- Off-street parking based upon demonstrated need, provided that the standards do not require more parking for emergency shelters than for other residential or commercial uses within the same zone.
- The size and location of exterior and interior onsite client waiting and client intake areas.
- The provision of onsite management.
- The proximity to other emergency shelters provided emergency shelters are not required to be more than 300 feet apart.
- The length of stay.
- Lighting.
- Security during hours that the emergency shelter is in operation.

Similarly, AB 2339 went into effect in 2023 and requires modification of emergency shelter planning as follows:

- Zones identified as appropriate for emergency shelters should also allow residential or other suitable uses for housing based on their physical attributes and proximity to transit and other services.
- Standards for emergency shelters must be objective.
- Local governments should maintain the capacity to meet the need for shelters throughout the eight-year cycle of the housing element.

Table 4-4 reveals that the City's Zoning Code allows Emergency Shelters, Transitional Housing, and Supportive Housing as uses by right within all residential zone districts subject only to those restrictions that apply to other dwellings of the same type in the same zone.

Title 18 of the Guadalupe Municipal Code covers "ZONING"; and Chapter 18.73 covers "DESIGN REVIEW", which does not pose a constraint to emergency shelters, transitional housing, and supportive housing. This is because close examination of this chapter of the Code reveals the following:

1. Section 18.73.010 on "Applicability" identifies a list of circumstances which require design review. The list does not include emergency shelters, transitional housing, and supportive housing but expressly identified "*New multifamily residential developments exceeding 3 units or additions to existing multifamily developments where the addition would result in a total of 3 or more units on a given property*".
2. Section 18.73.030 on "Exceptions and exemptions" is also silent on emergency shelters.
3. Section 18.73.100 on "Findings required for approval" is silent as well on emergency shelters.

Program 1.8 in the Housing Element requires the City to modify the zoning code to permit emergency shelters in zones where other residential uses are permitted in order to meet SB 2 and AB 2339 requirements.

4.1.1.3.2 Low-Barrier Navigation Centers (LBNC)

A Low-Barrier Navigation Center (LBNC) is a temporary, service-enriched shelter that helps homeless individuals and families to quickly obtain permanent housing with little or no barriers to entry. In that respect it projects a "Housing First," attitude to help persons and families in distress in advance of resolving the mitigating circumstances. The City has designated Leroy Park as a location for **emergency shelter during natural disasters**. Close examination of the Municipal Code confirms that Guadalupe has not faced the need for emergency shelters for individuals in the past given that it has hardly any homeless population. However, the Code needs to make provisions for such other circumstances that might need **emergency shelters for victims of spousal abuse, child abuse, and sudden, catastrophic economic situations**. This housing element adds programs (1.8) to allow emergency shelters in all zones that permit housing including defining LBCNs as a permitted use in districts that permit housing to comply with AB 101 without requirements for design review permits and discretionary actions as the design review decision-making criteria.

4.1.1.3.3 Permanent Supportive Housing: Residential Care Facilities and Group Homes

Residential care facilities include any family home, group home, or rehabilitation facility that provides non-medical care to persons in need of such personal services that are essential for daily living as protection, supervision, assistance, guidance, or training. State law (Health and Safety Code Sections 1267.8, 1566.3, and 1568.08) requires local governments to treat licensed group homes and residential care facilities with six or fewer residents the same as single-family uses. Furthermore, local governments must allow licensed residential care facilities in any area zoned for residential use and may not require

licensed residential care facilities of six or fewer persons to obtain conditional use permits or variances that are not required of other family dwellings. The City's zoning code permits such facilities on properties zoned single-family residential (R-1 and R-1-M), R-2 (Medium Density Residential), R-3 (High Density Residential), and G-C (General Commercial) zoning districts. In the R-2 and R-3 zoning districts, the Zoning Code limits the size of such facilities to no more than one occupant per 500 square foot of lot area. For minimum lot sizes of 1452 to 3630 square feet, this restriction translates to a range of 3 to 7 persons in each of these types of facilities. Amendments to the zoning code should modify the lot occupancy per person to 250 square feet for consistency with State law in the R-3 zone where lot sizes may be as small as 1452 square feet.

Although group homes operating as single-family residences that provide licensable services to more than six residents may be subject to conditional use or other discretionary approval processes, the State recommends that local governments provide flexible and efficient reasonable accommodations in these permitting processes. This means that some requests for exceptions to permitting processes should be resolved through reasonable accommodation procedures instead of conditional use procedures. In addition, any substantive requirements for these group homes must still comply with the local government's obligations to remove constraints on housing for persons with disabilities, affirmatively support it, and prevent discrimination against it.

The Guadalupe Municipal Code requires group homes of seven or more persons to receive a conditional use permit (CUP) and be treated like "employee housing". According to Table 4-4, employee housing (including farmworker housing) is permitted in multiple districts which include R-2, R-3, PD, MIX, G-C, and C-N zones. Thus, housing for group homes of seven or more people in a unit is treated as any other multifamily housing unit in the City. Although group homes operating as single-family residences that provide licensable services to more than six residents may be subject to conditional use or other discretionary approval processes, the State recommends that local governments provide flexible and efficient reasonable accommodations in these permitting processes. This means that some requests for exceptions to permitting processes should be resolved through reasonable accommodation procedures instead of conditional use procedures. In addition, any substantive requirements for these group homes must still comply with the local government's obligations to remove constraints on housing for persons with disabilities, affirmatively support it, and prevent discrimination against it. Program 1.3 is modified to address group homes of 7 or more people. Program 4.7 requires the City to offer reasonable accommodations in its permitting processes for group homes of 7 or more people.

4.1.1.3.4 Farmworker and Employee Housing Act

Similar to the requirement for transitional and supportive housing, Section 17021.5 of the Health and Safety Code requires that local jurisdictions treat employee housing for six persons or fewer the same as other housing types permitted in each zoning district. The City complies with the Employee Housing Act (Government Code Sections 17021.5). **Farmworker housing for six or fewer employees is treated as single-family housing and is allowed by right in all R-1, R-2, R-3, MIX, and G-C zones. Housing for seven or more employees in a unit is treated as any other multifamily housing unit in Guadalupe.**

Also, Section 17021.6 and Section 17021.8 of the Health and Safety Code have statutory requirements for employee housing as follows:

- Section 17021.6 of the Code requires that employee housing consisting of no more than 12 units or 36 beds are permitted in the same manner as other agricultural uses (not multifamily) in zones that allow agricultural uses.
- Section 17021.8 of the Code requires that eligible agricultural employee housing development be subject to a streamlined, ministerial approval process and not be subject to a conditional use permit (CUP).

Program 4.8 requires the City to update its municipal code by 2025 to address and comply with these two additional key statutory requirements in Section 17021.6 and Section 17021.8.

4.1.1.3.5 Housing for Persons with Disabilities

Both the Federal Fair Housing Act and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act impose an affirmative duty on local governments to make reasonable accommodations in the form of modifications or exceptions in zoning laws and other land use regulations when such accommodations may be necessary to afford disabled persons an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling. The Building Code adopted by the City of Guadalupe incorporates accessibility standards contained in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code.

Adherence to zoning and development standards in the City's Zoning Code can present a potential constraint on the development, maintenance, and improvement of housing for persons with disabilities. Such standards do not pose a major constraint for new construction or redevelopment on large parcels because there is typically ample design flexibility to include accommodations for persons with disabilities. However, for redevelopment or retrofitting of existing buildings on smaller lots, setback requirements may conflict with the provision of accommodations for persons with disabilities. Programs in the Housing Element call for modification of zoning standards short of a variance to provide for accommodations for persons with disabilities.

Notwithstanding constraints related to zoning and development standards, the City strives to provide reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities in the enforcement of building codes and issuance of building permits. The City takes special needs into consideration and allows for adjustment of specification if requested. The City may accept changes due to practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship in enforcing the Code. In addition, the Housing Element includes programs to establish a formal and written procedure to reasonably accommodate accessibility needs. As part of these programs, the City is to provide information to all interested parties regarding accommodations in zoning, permit processes, and application of building codes for persons with disabilities.

Compliance with accessibility standards contained in the Building Code could increase the cost of housing production and can also impact viability in the rehabilitation of older properties that need to be brought up to code. However, these regulations provide minimum standards that require compliance to assure the development of safe and accessible housing. In addition to providing disabled access in new

construction projects, Guadalupe also provides funding for retrofitting existing rental and owner-occupied housing for ADA access under the City's Housing Rehabilitation Program.

4.1.1.3.6 Single Room Occupancy

A single room occupancy unit (SRO) is a single room that is typically 80-250 square feet in size, sometimes with a sink and closet, but requires the occupant to share a communal bathroom, shower, and kitchen. This use is permitted by right in all R-2, R-3, and G-C zones and requires a conditional use permit in the MIX and C-N zones. It is only subject to those development and management standards that apply to residential development within the same zone. The Housing Element includes programs to facilitate the development of single room occupancy units in Guadalupe.

4.1.1.3.7 Mobile and Manufactured Homes

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65852.3, the location and permit process for manufactured housing should be regulated in the same manner as a conventional or stick-built structure. Specifically, Government Code Section 65852.3(a) requires that except for architectural requirements, a local government should only subject manufactured homes (also called mobile homes) to the same development standards as a conventional single-family residential dwelling on the same lot including, but not limited to, requirements for building setback, side and rear yard, enclosures, access, vehicle parking, aesthetics, and minimum square footage. Mobile and manufactured homes on permanent foundations are permitted in all residential zone districts. **It is noteworthy that individual manufactured homes are permitted in all residential zone districts, however, groups of new manufactured homes (referred to as mobile home parks) require the same approval and conditional use permits as groups of stick-built homes in a conventional PUD. Additionally, groups of manufactured homes are limited to the R-3 zone. Program 1.12 requires the City to amend the zoning ordinance to remove the constraint on development of manufactured housing.**

4.1.1.4 Standard Parking and Street Requirements

4.1.1.4.1 Parking Standards

Excessive parking standards can pose a significant constraint to housing development by increasing development costs and reducing the potential land availability for project amenities or additional units. Many parking standards do not reflect actual parking demand. Table 4-5 lists the parking standards in the Guadalupe Zoning Code. These requirements are generally not a development constraint and are comparable to those in jurisdictions throughout the state.

Table 4-5: Parking Space & Street Width Standards

Type of Use	Requirement
<i>Parking</i>	
Single Dwelling Unit	1 space per 800 square feet; no more than 2 spaces required
Multiple Dwelling Unit	1.5 spaces per dwelling unit
Convalescent and Care Facilities	1 space per 4 guest beds and 1 space per 2 employees per shift
<i>Streets</i>	
Residential Street	52 feet wide

Type of Use	Requirement
Collector Street	56 feet wide
Local Arterial	72 to 84 feet wide
Principal Arterial	106 to 126 feet wide

Source: City of Guadalupe Zoning Code.

Parking requirements may be reduced in a Planned Residential Development. There are no other formal provisions for parking reductions, say for housing serving persons with disabilities, which might demonstrate a lower need. The Housing Element includes programs to establish a formal and written procedure to reasonably accommodate accessibility needs, including reduced parking for special needs housing.

4.1.1.4.2 Street Standards

Table 4-5 also lists the standards for street width in the Guadalupe Zoning Code. These requirements compare to those in jurisdictions throughout the state and are generally not a development constraint.

4.1.1.4.3 Curbs and Sidewalks

The Guadalupe Zoning Code has several specifications for the design and installation of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks to assure consistency and safety throughout the City. The specifications are generally not a development constraint and compare to those in jurisdictions throughout the state; they include the following stipulations:

- Construct curbs and gutters separately from sidewalks.
- Use Weakened Plane Joints for all joints, except expansion joints shall be placed in curbs, gutters, and sidewalks at BCR and ECR and around utility poles located in sidewalk areas.
- Construct Weakened Plane Joints at regular intervals, up to 10 feet for walks and up to 20 feet for gutters.
- Align sidewalk and curb joints.
- Curb and gutter widths are generally 24 inches.
- Sidewalk widths should be 4 to 6 feet.
- Curbs and gutters can be constructed of Portland Cement Concrete or of Asphalt Concrete.
- Anchor curbs with dowels or epoxy.
- Measure the grade line at the curb line at top of curb; round all exposed corners on PCC curbs and gutters by half an inch and make gutters integral with the curb unless otherwise specified.

4.1.1.5 Other Potential Governmental Constraints

Since the early 2000s, policies and programs in the City’s General Plan and Housing Element have maintained the collection of affordable housing development fees for large developments. This Housing Element will continue to retain the pertinent policy and associated program which require new housing projects of at least 50 units that are located on land that has received an increase in allowable density through a general plan amendment, rezoning, or specific plan to pay a fee of 2% of the building

valuation into an affordable housing trust fund. The City Council may waive the fee if it has determined that the project provides enough lower income housing units commensurate with that which the collection of the fee would generate. The applicant seeking a waiver would request this in the development approval process and present the rationale for how the subject project meets the criteria for the waiver. The affordable housing fee requirement is not expected to present a significant constraint on projects since the economic benefit of increased units would be larger than the cost of complying with the policy. Furthermore, for projects with affordable housing components that would equal or exceed the value of the calculated fee, the City Council could waive the fee.

4.1.1.5.1 Building Codes

The Guadalupe Building Code was updated from the 2007 California Building Code (CBC) to the 2016 CBC, which determines the minimum residential construction requirements for all of California. There are no local amendments to the State Building Code. The 2016 CBC promotes safe housing and is not considered a significant constraint to housing production as it is the minimum necessary to protect public health, safety, and welfare. The City's code (15.04.010) states:

“The following codes are hereby adopted as the Building Code, Residential Code, Administrative Code, Electrical Code, Plumbing Code, Mechanical Code, Energy Code, Green Building Standards Code and Referenced Standards Code of the City of Guadalupe, and are incorporated herein as if fully set forth, with such further incorporation and amendment of individual sections and appendices as following below:

- A. 2016 California Building Code, Volumes one and two.
- B. 2016 California Residential Code.
- C. 2016 California Administrative Code.
- D. 2016 California Electrical Code.
- E. 2015 National Electrical Code (NEC).
- F. 2016 California Plumbing Code.
- G. 2016 California Mechanical Code.
- H. 2016 California Energy Code.
- I. 2016 California Green Building Standards Code.
- J. 2016 California Referenced Standards Code. (Ord. 2016-458 §1)”.

4.1.1.5.2 Code Enforcement

Guadalupe is like most cities, which largely respond to code enforcement problems after receipt of complaints. The usual process begins with a field investigation following a complaint. The investigator assesses the problem if the complaint is valid. The City responds through letters, phone calls, or site visits to serious violations that have implications for health and safety. The City encourages voluntary compliance. If compliance is not forthcoming, the City may take more aggressive action through the legal process. The City's philosophy is to mitigate serious health or safety problems, but to allow the property owners reasonable time and flexibility to comply. The City attempts to balance the need to ensure safe housing against the potential loss of affordable housing that might result from overly strict enforcement. There is no indication that code enforcement actions have unnecessarily restricted the use of older buildings or inhibited rehabilitation.

4.1.1.5.3 Building Heights

Section 18.52.020 of the Municipal Code on “Height limits” states the following:

“In R-1, R-2 and R-3 districts, the height of a building or structure shall not exceed 2 stories, or a height of 35 feet. In all other districts, a building or structure shall not exceed 50 feet in height. Additional height may be permitted by granting a conditional use permit. (Ord. 189 Art. 4 §3, 1980)”

The 2042 General Plan recommends compact mixed-use development in multiple parts of the City and the increase in intensity of development for a more efficient way to develop the City. Consistent with the General Plan, this Housing Element includes Program 6.4 for an amendment to the zoning code to enable development of three-story and four-story structures in areas designated for multi-family housing as an avenue to produce more housing for the available acreage, reduce cost per unit, and make these types of units even more affordable. This is possible under the existing code under conditional use permits, but the amendment can make development of affordable units more attractive to developers especially where lot sizes are limited.

Building heights do vary depending on the design of the building and the use of the space. For residential structures, it is conceivable that a 35-foot height limit would easily allow for a two-story building but could also allow for a three-story building under careful customization. The following illustrations explain:

- *Two-story scenario* – The height of each story in a building is based on ceiling height, floor thickness, and building materials and averages about 14 feet. Therefore, a 35-foot height limit on buildings in a district would traditionally allow for up to a two-story building plus up to a 7-foot ridge height of its roof structure.
- *Three-story scenario* – However, the standards from the California Residential Code allow for ceiling heights as low as 7 feet while the California Building Code allows for ceiling heights as low as 7.5 feet. Assuming a floor thickness of 1.5 feet would peg the height of one story at 8.5 to 9 feet plus the height of the roof structure. This is consistent with the rule of thumb that the slab-to-slab height in residential buildings is typically in the range of 8 to 10 feet (or 2.4 to 3 meters). Therefore, a 35-foot height limit on a building could allow for up to a three-story building plus up to a 5-foot ridge height of its roof structure.

This Housing Element includes Program 6.9 for an amendment to the municipal code to drop the “two-story” restriction and enable development of three-story structures within the 35-foot height limit in R-1, R-2, and R-3 districts. The height limit is necessary to accommodate the capabilities of the equipment available to the City’s first responders during fire or other safety emergencies.

4.1.2 Residential Development Processing and Permit Procedures

The time that processing and permit procedures add to the development process can be a constraint to the production and improvement of housing. Multiple levels of reviews and discretionary review requirements as well as costly conditions of approval can create uncertainty in the development process, increase the overall financial risk assumed by the developer, and increase the final cost of housing. In recognition of this potential drawback, the City has streamlined its procedures to simplify

the application process and remove obstacles to housing development. For instance, the City has posted most information and moved many service functions on-line to make it easier for applicants to access information, submit applications and plans, track the progress of applications remotely, and receive approvals online.

The time required to review, process, and permit applications and ultimately the level required and cost involved depend on the scope of the project and the type of application. Staff can review and approve small projects without a public hearing. Large projects, like planned unit developments or major multi-family housing developments, would typically require hearings at the design review board and Planning Commission. Recent changes to State law limit the City's ability to require such hearings as well as the City's discretion in denying projects that are consistent with adopted plans and standards.

4.1.2.1 Permit Types

The Municipal Code identifies the procedures, components for review, as well as findings required for approval. The City's guidelines indicate to applicants the City's expectations for new projects while providing standards for staff, review boards, and the Planning Commission in evaluating projects. The main permit types are the following:

Administrative Design Review permits – These obtain approval from the Community Development Director or designated staff. These permits generally do not require a public hearing, although the Community Development Director may refer an application to the Design Review Board for recommendations if deemed necessary. Typical projects requiring such referrals are single-story new homes on flag lots, conversion of single-family residences to duplexes, and additions that include a bedroom or are over 500 square feet in hillside areas.

Minor Design Review permits – These obtain zoning approval following a public hearing. The Community Development Director may refer an application to the Design Review Board following findings from the zoning review. Example projects include large multi-family and second story additions, new two-story homes and duplexes, and additions of over 500 square feet in hillside areas.

Major Design Review permits – These obtain approval from the Planning Commission in a public hearing, typically following a recommendation from the Design Review Board. The applicant can appeal the action of the Commission to the City Council. Hillside development, new residences near ridgelines, and large multi-family structures typically require a Major Design Review.

Applications for **design review permits** obtain approval upon the determination that the project design meets the following conditions:

- It is consistent with the general plan and zoning code;
- It is consistent with all applicable site, architecture and landscaping design criteria and guidelines for the district in which the site is located;
- It minimizes adverse environmental impacts; and
- It will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, nor materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.

4.1.2.2 Permit Process

Planning permits for development generally require the completion of an application form, payment of fees, preparation of a written statement or narrative that describes the project with photographs, a site plan, project data, floor plans, roof plans, landscape plans, and elevations or sections as the case may be. Depending on location and scope, a large project may also require grading plans, boundary surveys, historic resource evaluations, geotechnical and soils reports, arborist reports, and local traffic assessments. Prior to receiving a building permit, projects to build new housing units would typically require an environmental and design review permit.

4.1.2.3 Levels of Review

There are various levels of review and processing of residential development applications, depending on the size and complexity of the development. Due to budgetary constraints, the Planning Commission was disbanded in 2012 and therefore the City of Guadalupe City Council is involved in making decisions about all large, discretionary development projects. City staff process small projects that do not include rezoning or general plan amendment, subdivision of land, conditional use permit, or a variance via “over the counter” zoning clearance. The City also has a design review process, which may be required for residential developments, depending on the scope and location of the proposed development.

City staff review all planning permit applications for completeness. Discretionary actions (such as rezoning, tract maps, and conditional use permits) undergo environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Once the application is deemed complete, staff review zoning clearances for conformity with the Zoning Code and General Plan. If the project is in conformity with the Zoning Code and General Plan, staff issues zoning clearance, and the applicant can apply for and obtain a building permit. In practice, most Planning applications undergo concurrent Planning Department review and Building Department plan check, such that the applicant is often able to obtain a building permit with the zoning clearance.

4.1.2.4 Processing Time and Requests for Lesser Densities

The time it takes to get through the planning entitlement and permitting process could pose a potential constraint, but City staff strive to assist applicants during the process. In 2007, the City put into place a Development Review Committee so that the processing of discretionary permit applications is conducted efficiently and with minimal staff delays. Project review by the Development Review Committee has proven not to be a constraint but has rather minimized staff processing times. The Development Review Committee includes representatives from all City Departments with responsibility for review of discretionary development projects, including Planning, Building, Fire, City Engineer, and Public Works. The committee reviews discretionary applications and provides feedback to applicants on missing or insufficient items during the application completeness process. Once the application is deemed complete and scheduled for a decision, the Development Review Committee reviews the application again to develop department-specific recommended conditions of approval. The City's permit processing for both discretionary permits and ministerial permits is efficient with no backlog of cases. Table 4-6 lists typical permit processing times. As noted, a typical single-family residential subdivision takes on average 6 to 12 months to process, depending on whether a tract map or parcel map is required. A typical multi-family residential development requires a Design Review Permit and

zoning clearance and has an average processing time of 2 to 3 months. Therefore, development processing procedures in Guadalupe do not present a significant constraint to housing production.

Depending on the size and complexity of the project, processing time between planning approval and issuance of building permit could be a matter of weeks to months. This time frame is predominantly up to the applicant and not the City. [Recent data revealed the following:](#)

General Timeline for processing a single-family home in Guadalupe: the total time from submittal to notification to pick up the permit was 79 days. BUT the total number of days that the City (and contracted plan checker) had the application was only 16 days. The zoning clearance (for planning) was also completed during the same timeframe. Actual dates are not available, but experience indicates that the building permit process takes a lot more time than for planning.

Discretionary projects: Between 2019 and 2023, there were five projects that required discretionary action. Processing time (defined as the date when an application was deemed complete to the date when the final approval was given) ranged from a low of 26 days to a high of 133 days or an average of 53 days, which means typically within two months.

During the 5th Cycle, there were no requests from project applicants to develop at densities below those zoned or identified in the sites inventory. Recent development activity reflects the opposite tendency whereby a large developer like the Pasadera Development negotiated with the City to build more units than originally enshrined in the planned unit development agreement for the DJ Farms specific plan. Smaller developers have been maximizing infill development with multifamily units.

Table 4-6: Typical Permit Processing Time Requirements

Type of Approval or Permit	Typical Processing Time	Approval Body
Site Plan Review	30 days	City Staff
Minor Use Permit	30 days	City Staff
Conditional Use Permit	3 months	City Council
Variance	3 months	City Council
Zone Change	6 months	City Council
General Plan Amendment	6 months	City Council
Design Review	2 to 3 months	City Council
Tract Maps	12 months	City Council
Parcel Maps	6 months	City Council
Initial Environmental Study	30 days	Planning Staff
Negative declaration	2 months	City Council
Environmental Impact Report	9 months	City Council

Source: City of Guadalupe Housing Element, 2019.

Ordinance No. 2008-393 adopted the Design Review requirements and inserted them into the Zoning Code in April 2008 as Chapter 18.73 of the code. The chapter lists the procedures, components for review, as well as findings required for approval. Staff review plans and a planning application for projects requiring a design review permit (DRP) for completeness, and then schedule them for consideration of the Planning Commission (whose duties the City Council performs). A separate DRP is not required when the project, such as a parcel map, tract map, or a conditional use permit, has a component that already would require Planning Commission or City Council review. Projects that would otherwise only require a zoning clearance do not trigger the DRP.

Certain residential projects are exempt from a DRP including most single-family residential projects and duplexes not on Main Street or Guadalupe Street, or in the City's Central Business District. The DRP requirement would most typically occur in the case of multi-family or mixed-use development in the City's Central Business District, or multi-family development elsewhere in the City. While the requirement for a DRP does add to the project's permit fees (by \$1,500 for minor and \$3,500 for major DRP), it does not result in a substantial constraint or disincentive to development. The purview of the City Council is specific to the design of the project as it relates to compliance with other Zoning Code regulations; staff evaluate development standards. Section 18.73.90 of the Zoning Code describes eight design components the City Council considers upon application for a DRP, which cover such design issues as layout and orientation; height, bulk, and scale; and interference with scenic views.

In addition, Section 18.73.100 identifies thirteen findings that the approving agency should assess prior to approval of a DRP. These findings represent specific design objectives by which staff evaluates the development, which include compatibility and harmony with neighborhoods; grading and landscaping; appropriate integration of mechanical and service systems; and conformity with the General Plan. They are intended to enhance the appearance and value of property and the livability of neighborhoods. They do not represent a constraint to development but simply help assure orderly and safe development in the City. Nonetheless, to provide greater certainty for residential projects subject to the Design Review Process, programs in the updated General Plan and the Housing Action Plan propose establishment of design guidelines to illustrate and guide the application of standards.

4.1.2.5 SB 35 Affordable Housing Streamlined Approval Procedures

SB 35 was signed into law in 2017 and became effective on January 1, 2018. The bill amends Government Code Section 65913.4 to require local entities to streamline the approval of certain housing projects by providing a ministerial approval process, removing the requirement for CEQA analysis, and removing the requirement for discretionary entitlements. It allows qualifying development projects with certain minimum affordable housing guarantees and permanent supportive housing and navigation centers to move quickly through the local government review process and restricts the ability of local governments to reject such proposals.

The bill created a streamlined approval process for infill developments in localities that have failed to meet their regional housing needs allocation (RHNA). SB 35 requires that local jurisdictions that have not met their RHNA goals have a "by right" process for qualifying residential development near major transit stops. Eligible projects must include two or more dwelling units, provide certain levels of affordable

housing, and pay prevailing wages for construction. SB 35 applications are also eligible for streamlined processing and are not subject to CEQA review or a public hearing with a review board. To qualify for SB 35 approval, a project must set aside ten percent or more of its units for lower income households.

The City has streamlined its procedures to simplify the application process and remove obstacles to housing development in general. For instance, when processing a request to retrofit homes for accessibility, the procedure is the same as for any home improvement and its handling depends on the scope of the change. The City does not impose special permit procedures or requirements that could impede the retrofitting of homes for accessibility and for meeting **ADA requirements**. City officials are not aware of any instances in which an applicant experienced delays or rejection of a retrofit proposal for accessibility to persons with disabilities. Program 1.11 of this housing element requires the City to modify the zoning code to expressly address requirements of SB 35.

4.1.2.6 SB 330 The Housing Crisis Act (HCA) Procedures

The Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (HCA), commonly known as Senate Bill 330 (SB 330) became State law in October 2019 to respond to the California housing crisis. SB 330 is based on the notion that jurisdictions have in place the planning for much of the housing need. However, so much of the housing is not being built and developers assert the lack of housing production is due to growing regulatory requirements, permit processing delays, and excessive impact and service fees.

SB 330 prohibits local jurisdictions from enacting new laws that would effectively (a) reduce the legal limit on new housing within their borders and (b) delay new housing via administrative or other regulatory barriers. Through its expiration in 2030, SB 330 is to achieve the following:

- Prevent local governments from downzoning unless they upzone an equivalent amount elsewhere within their boundaries
- Suspend the enactment of local downzoning and housing construction moratoriums
- Require timely processing of housing permits that follow zoning rules
- Ensure the demolition of housing does not result in a net loss of units
- Postpone requirements for voter approval of zoning and general plan changes
- Require resettlement benefits and first right of refusal in new units or compensation for rehousing for renters who may be displaced.

Ultimately therefore, the HCA aims to achieve the following:

1. Increase residential unit development;
2. Protect existing housing inventory; and
3. Expedite permit processing.

The HCA does not apply to housing development projects located within a very high fire hazard severity zone. Projects that meet the following criteria are eligible for benefits under SB 330 [Gov. Code Section 65589.5(h)(2)]:

- Residential projects (excluding hotels, assisted living, or other commercial dwelling units). Single-family, Accessory and/or Junior Accessory Dwelling Units are excluded from dwelling unit count;
- Mixed-use development consisting of residential and nonresidential uses with at least two-thirds of the square footage of the project designated for residential use (not including hotels, assisted living, or other commercial dwelling units);
- Transitional Housing or Supportive Housing projects.

Program 1.11 of this housing element requires the City to modify the zoning code to expressly address the streamline and other requirements of SB 35 and SB 330.

4.1.2.7 Environmental Clearance

The City complies with requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for state and local government agencies to inform decision makers and the public about the potential environmental impacts of proposed projects and to reduce those environmental impacts to the extent feasible. Thus, CEQA requirements could pose constraints to housing projects under certain circumstances since environmental review can affect the duration of project approval and its cost. When applicable, environmental clearance is required to assess the project's impact and establish whether public services and facilities are adequate to accommodate increases in demand before any development permit is granted. Staff make the determination early in the process whether the project is exempt from CEQA or requires preparation of a Negative Declaration (ND), a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), or an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). CEQA determinations are made concurrently with initial processing once an application is deemed complete, so they can be reviewed by the approval authority concurrently with project entitlement. All CEQA determinations and required noticing is done within the timelines required by State law and in a manner consistent with the Permit Streamlining Act.

Many smaller projects are categorically exempt from CEQA, which means no environmental review is necessary. Mitigated Negative Declarations (MNDs) and Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) are most commonly associated with projects on sites that require rezoning or General Plan Amendments, or that are located on hillside sites, in wetland or riparian areas, near important historic and/or archaeological resources, or in areas where natural hazards such as flooding and wildfire are present. CEQA mitigation requirements, such as special requirements for construction to avoid impacts to special status species, may add time and cost to the development process. Fees for the preparation of environmental impact reports also may be substantial, as they cover the City's costs for contracting out the service.

Since 2017, every project in Guadalupe fell under the CEQA CLASS 32 exemptions for infill projects. There was only one Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Escalante Meadows project. Even with the MND, project approval only took 133 days including a 30-day circulation period for the MND. Therefore, environmental clearance has not historically posed constraints to housing development in the City.

4.1.3 Development Fees

4.1.3.1 Assessment Fees

State law limits the charging of fees to process development permits to a reasonable cost of providing the service. The City and other public agencies charge various fees and assessments to cover the costs of processing permit applications and providing services and facilities such as schools, parks, and infrastructure. Assessment of many of the fees depends on the magnitude of the project's impact or on the extent of the benefits to be derived. The three main types of development and permitting fees are:

- 1) Planning Application fees, which are collected at the outset of a project;
- 2) Development Impact Fees; and
- 3) Plan check fees which are collected at the end of the process during issuance of the building permits.

The City updated planning application fees as of the 2020/2021 fiscal year. The intent of this revision was to better ensure that the City collects enough funds to cover the staff costs of processing the applications. Many of the City's discretionary permit application fees are now actual costs based on deposits collected at time of application submittal. Most ministerial permits are one-time flat fees. All development projects including the development of new residential units require a zoning clearance, which is a ministerial permit that allows staff to confirm that the proposed development meets Zoning Code standards and requirements. Development projects may also require a Design Review Permit, although most single-family residential projects and additions are exempt from this requirement. Large development projects may require a tract map or a conditional use permit, and some projects require rezoning or are planned residential developments. Table 4-7 includes the most common planning fees and **Appendix D** includes the complete schedule of fees.

The City's development impact fees, which include all County and regional impact fees, are not excessive and are lower than or equal to those levied in surrounding cities and thus do not present a significant obstacle to production of affordable housing. Guadalupe collects a parks development fee and a public facilities fee. Park development fees per residential unit are \$150. Public facilities fees are \$0.10 per square foot on multi-family projects. The Guadalupe Union School District also charges fees. Large development projects may attract other development impact fees for, say traffic impacts or sewer service, as part of a Development Agreement. The City of Guadalupe is responsible for such public services as water, wastewater, fire, and police; therefore, no county or regional fees are required for these services.

The actual total development impact fee per unit derives from all fees that are required for the project. Some fees may not be applicable to certain projects. Some fees are based on sliding scale for size of unit or number of units in multi-family projects. Typical fees range from \$6,000 and up for a single-family unit to \$22,000 for a multi-family project of seven units or more. The total fee depends on how many units are being built and if plan check fees for grading or other activities apply.

Development and processing fees are lower in Guadalupe than in other areas. Furthermore, Guadalupe's financial condition makes further reductions in already low fees infeasible. It is the City's intent to give

high priority for processing low-income residential projects; however, the processing time for all types of projects is considerably shorter in Guadalupe than other cities in the area.

4.1.3.2 On-Site and Off-Site Improvements

In order to provide a safe and suitable environment for residential development, the City requires that certain public improvements be made. Each dwelling unit must connect to the City's water and sewer systems and project sites must properly capture and discharge runoff water into detention basins or storm drain systems. The City also requires that curbs, gutters, and sidewalks be placed along the frontage of every lot on which new construction or significant alteration is done. Table 4-7 lists public facility and traffic impact fees. These and other site improvement costs are typical of all cities in California and do not impose a significant constraint on the development of housing in Guadalupe. The City does not impose any unusual requirements as conditions of approval for new development. City regulations generally intend to facilitate private development and new construction.

Table 4-7: Fees that Affect Housing Production

Type of Approval or Permit	Flat Fee or Deposit for Cost-Based Fee	
Final Map	\$7,400	Deposit
General Plan Amendment and Zone Change - minor	\$1,000	Deposit
General Plan Amendment and Zone Change - major	\$15,000	Deposit
Encroachment Permit	\$63	Flat Fee
Public Improvement Plan Checking	\$1460 per subdivision or \$290 per single lot	
Public Facility and Traffic Impact Fees	Subdivision = \$300 per lot Annexation = \$800 per lot	
Building Permit	Fee required by CBC	
Grading Permit	Fee required by CBC	
Water Connection Fee	Flat Fee based on the diameter of the service line	
Sewer Connection Fee (Single-Family Unit)	\$3,542 per single-family residence	
Sewer Connection Fee (Multi-Family Unit)	\$2,361 per unit	

Source: City of Guadalupe, Master Fee Schedule, 2020.

4.1.4 Regional Constraints

Regional constraints can result from policies of external jurisdictions that affect a community. In Guadalupe, regional constraints are possible from policies of Santa Barbara County or the Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) if the City must follow those policies. The Santa Barbara LAFCO is a supra-local planning agency that reviews and evaluates all proposals for formation of special districts, incorporation of cities, annexation to special districts or cities, consolidation of districts, and merger of districts with cities. If Guadalupe needed outward expansion to accommodate growth of housing, it would need approval from its LAFCO. However, Guadalupe's Sphere of Influence, which represents the City's ultimate anticipated growth boundary is congruent with City limits, thus precluding

outward expansion. This could have been an important governmental constraint to meeting the City's housing needs except the updated 2042 General Plan has determined that Guadalupe already has enough land within its City limits to accommodate growth to 2042 and beyond. Chapter 3 has additional details on availability of land in Guadalupe for housing.

4.1.5 Accessory Dwelling Units

Amendments to the Guadalupe Municipal Code in August 2017, January 2019, December, 2023, and December 2024 revised Chapter 18.53 of the Code on “ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS”. The Municipal Code formerly titled this chapter, “SECONDARY HOUSING UNITS.” The revamped chapter is intended to comply with the latest provisions of State law (Government Code Section 65852.2), and to implement the policies in the City's 2042 General Plan and the Housing Element. The update allows accessory dwelling units (ADU) and Junior ADUs (JADU) through ministerial review in all Residential Districts, subject to certain requirements and standards, which include:

- An attached or a detached residential dwelling unit that provides complete independent living facilities for one or more persons and includes permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation on the same parcel as a primary dwelling unit.
- An ADU may be an efficiency unit (as defined in Section 17958.1 of Health and Safety Code), a manufactured home (as defined in Section 18007 of the Health and Safety Code Rev: 01-28-2019), or a multi-room permanent structure.
- The minimum total square footage of the accessory dwelling unit shall be 110 square feet (suitable for an efficiency unit) and the maximum size shall be no more than 1,200 square feet.
- “Junior ADU” means a unit which is at least 110 square feet and no more than 500 square feet.
- Its implementation involves such usual requirements for new housing as filing an application with the planning department for ministerial approval, providing site plan, floor plans, elevations, and cross sections that are drawn to scale, and payment of application fees in the City’s most current schedule of fees.
- A development or impact fee shall not be imposed upon the development of an ADU less than 750 square feet. Any impact fees charged for an ADU of 750 square feet or more shall be charged proportionately in relation to the square footage of the primary dwelling unit.
- Accessory dwelling units are only allowed on lots that allow single-family homes and multifamily uses where an existing legal single-family dwelling or multifamily use exists or is proposed.
- Besides the required parking for the primary dwelling unit, there should be one parking space per ADU except that tandem parking is allowed for ADUs as stated in Government Code Section 65852.2(a)(l)(D)(x) if the driveway is sufficiently long to accommodate vehicles without any encroachment on a sidewalk or street.
- Rental of the accessory dwelling unit is allowed for 30 days or longer, and separate from rental of the primary residence. For an accessory dwelling unit to be rented for a period of less than 30 days, the owner shall be required to comply with the provisions of Chapter 18.55 (Short Term Rentals).
- The ADU may not be sold separately from the primary dwelling unit unless specific requirements are met through Government Code Section 65852.26. Once a detached ADU is constructed, an

owner may sell the unit independently, akin to condominiums. A Homeowner's Association (HOA) must be established prior to sale to manage the maintenance costs of shared spaces and the property's exterior. A JADU may not be sold separately. All conditions of the permit, restrictive covenants, and other contractual agreements with the City apply to the property.

Certain provisions of the Code promote affordability thereby reducing governmental constraints and ultimately cost on the implementation of ADUs. These include fees related to utility connections and access as well as reduced parking requirements as follows:

- ADUs are not new residential uses for the purpose of calculating utility connection fees or capacity charges for water and sewer service. ADUs within existing residence (e.g., basement) or an existing accessory structure (e.g., converted garage) do not need to install new or separate utility connections or pay related connection fees or capacity charges.
- New attached and detached accessory dwelling units, however, may pay connection fees or capacity charges that are proportionate to the burden of the unit on the water or sewer system based on the size of the unit or the number of plumbing fixtures.
- Two-story detached ADUs are allowed but must limit the major access to stairs, decks, entry doors, and windows to the interior of the lot or an alley.
- Only one (1) curb cut is permitted per parcel and no additional driveways or access points should be created to accommodate the accessory or main dwelling unit.
- Access to a first story ADU or ADA accessible ramp may be permitted in the front of the primary dwelling.

ADU parking is not required in instances where the ADU is: (a) located within one-half mile of public transit; (b) located within any Historic Overlay District that may be in existence at the time a zoning clearance or building permit for an ADU is requested; and (c) part of the existing single family residence, or an existing accessory structure except when a garage, carport, or covered parking structure is demolished or converted to construct the ADU.

Recent updates to ADU requirements in the Municipal Code have not posed constraints to ADU production. ADU activity in Guadalupe over the four-year period between November 2019 and November 2023 surged to 80 including 53 completely constructed units, 21 units approved but not completed, and 6 in the planning process. At this rate, Guadalupe is on track to produce approximately a dozen ADUs per year. Final records showed that the City processed 38 building permit applications for ADUs and issued 26 occupancy clearances for ADUs during calendar year 2023. Therefore, applications for ADUs accounted for over 57 percent of the total applications for new housing during the year.

4.2 Non-Governmental Constraints

Non-governmental constraints are primarily market-driven and generally outside direct government control. However, local governments can influence and offset negative impacts of non-governmental constraints through responsive programs and policies. Analyzing specific housing cost components including the availability of financing, cost of land, and construction costs assists a local government in developing and implementing housing and land-use programs that respond to prevailing conditions.

Factors that influence the cost of new housing may be beyond a locality's control, yet municipalities can create such essential preconditions as favorable zoning and development standards as well as fast-track permit processing among others to facilitate development of a variety of housing types at affordable levels. For instance, Ordinance. Ord. 2019-478 §1 broadly defines a “Family” as follows:

"Family" means **One or more persons occupying a dwelling unit and living as a single housekeeping unit.**"

This has facilitated the qualification of non-family households to obtain affordable and assisted housing. This is particularly helpful when persons with disabilities need to join others who they may not even relate to by blood in living arrangements.

4.2.1 Fiscal Constraints

Many of the constraints to new (and especially affordable) housing production stem from insufficient funding, which is a common problem throughout the State, but particularly in Guadalupe. Proposition 13 limits the increase of property assessments to two percent per year, unless the property is sold, in which case it is reassessed at its selling price. Property taxes comprise approximately 56 percent of the City's total tax revenue while in other California cities this percentage is as low as 25 percent. As a result of this level of dependency on property taxes, the City admits having a difficult time maintaining needed services. This makes the City less able to use direct fiscal means to promote housing production.

4.2.1.1 Availability of Financing

The availability of financing affects a household's ability to purchase a home or improve it. For example, in Guadalupe, it can be difficult for very low, low, and moderate-income first-time homebuyers to acquire enough savings and income to pay for down payment, closing costs, monthly mortgage, tax, and insurance. It can also be challenging for households in these income groups to rehabilitate their homes. However, a few private financing and government assistance programs are available to the community as discussed in Chapter 3 on Resources for Residential Development.

4.2.1.2 Cost of Land

The cost of land varies and influences the cost of housing production. Cost factors include location, the market value of land as reflected in its unit price per square foot, the intended use (whether residential or commercial) reflected in its zoning designation, the number of proposed units or density of development permitted on the site, and the size of the parcel. Land that is conveniently located in a desirable area that is zoned for residential or commercial uses will likely tend to be more valuable and thus more expensive than a remote piece of land that is zoned for agricultural uses.

The County Assessor's office estimated the value of a single-family residential lot with water and sewer service at \$50,000 to \$66,000. When the DJ Farms lot 5 subdivision was approved in November 2014 the cost of a lot averaged approximately \$65,000 per lot, which is toward the upper end of the County Assessor's estimate. With price stability in the real estate market the price of land could remain in the same ballpark but recent escalations in the price of real estate would suggest higher prices of land.

4.2.1.3 Site Improvement Costs

Non-governmental site improvement costs may include the cost of providing access to the site, clearing the site, and grading building pad areas. In the case of a subdivision, such costs may also include major improvements like building roads and installing new infrastructure. As with land costs, multiple factors such as site topography and proximity to established roads, sewer lines, and water lines can affect site improvement costs. Site improvement costs typically also include engineering and other technical assistance costs to assure construction of the development according to established codes and standards. For the DJ Farms lot 5 subdivision, which was approved in November 2014, site improvement costs added to the approximately \$65,000 price per lot. Site costs have not been extraordinary in the City compared to its neighbors.

4.2.1.4 Cost of Construction

Construction costs do vary widely depending on the environmental conditions and scale of development. Important determinants of construction costs include the amenities built into the unit, materials used, the prevailing labor rate, and any unusual project site conditions that require special construction measures. In Guadalupe, expansive soils and mitigation of liquefaction risk often necessitate more extensive footings for houses that could increase construction costs. The unit construction cost for multi-family residences such as apartments is generally lower than single-family residences. The average construction cost of a good quality multifamily apartment averaged approximately \$65 to \$75 per square foot in 2015. The 80 units of newly re-constructed affordable apartments at the Escalante Meadows Apartments cost a total of \$18,238,141. This converts to averages of \$227,980 per unit (excluding the cost of land) and \$200 per square foot in 2023. Comparatively, a 1200 square-foot, 5-year-old, single-family home in the Pasadera development sold in March 2024 (according to Zillow) for \$579,000 or \$483 per square foot in Guadalupe. A new construction is bound to cost more under prevailing wage rates.

4.2.1.5 Prevailing Wages

State and federal laws require that when government funds assist affordable housing projects, the units must be constructed using the prevailing wages adopted by the State Department of Industrial Relations or the Federal Department of labor. Wages typically add 25 to 30 percent to the cost of construction. Given Guadalupe's proximity to large population centers, there is no issue with finding the requisite labor at prevailing wages.

4.2.2 Citizen Behavior

Housing preferences have evolved over the past half century. From the inception of track home construction of 900 to 1200 square feet, consumers have opted for predominantly large, detached houses of two to three times the typical sizes of the past. The expectation to live in large homes is not compatible with affordable housing in California and has contributed to the high cost of living in the State. Bias towards single-family residences can become a constraint when neighbors oppose the location of denser, more affordable housing in their neighborhoods.

Auto dependency causes housing expansion to increase road traffic volumes, congestion, and noise. Community disdain for these types of problems sometimes leads to opposition to all types of

development whether residential, commercial, or industrial. Community opposition can delay housing production, increase costs, and impair a city's ability to meet its housing and economic goals. However, community opposition to single-family or multi-family development is typically not a factor and therefore does not pose a constraint to housing development in Guadalupe.

4.2.3 Environmental Constraints

4.2.3.1 Environmental Factors

The environmental factors that have the potential to constrain residential development include City boundaries and limits, protected agricultural land, proximity to a coastal zone, floodable areas, and seismic faults. Figures 4-1, 4-2, and 4-3 identify the key environmental constraints in and around Guadalupe. In addition to the coastal zone, Williamson Act lands, floodable areas, and habitat areas fall almost entirely outside City boundaries and thus do not pose constraints to housing development.

The City's General Plan policies include measures to protect sensitive areas from development, and to protect public safety by avoiding development in hazardous areas. While these policies could constrain residential development, they are necessary to promote the public good. It is important to also note that these environmental factors do not substantially constrain vacant lands identified in Appendix B to accommodate the City's fair share of housing.

4.2.3.2 Boundaries/Limits

City boundaries limit the available land for housing development. The Santa Maria River defines the northern boundary and limits expansion to the north of the City. As Figure 4-1 shows, Williamson Act contract lands surround nearly all the City's boundaries to the east, south, and west and thus limit expansion in those directions as well. However, Guadalupe has ample available land within its boundaries to accommodate its share of housing needs into the long-term future.

Prime agricultural land surrounds The City of Guadalupe. Therefore, it is limited in its ability to expand outwards. Expansion of the City is limited to (a) infill via the use of the minimally available vacant parcels of land within the built-up area; (b) the Pasadera PUD area; and (c) conversion to mixed-uses. Typically, private developers construct the newer apartments (e.g., 11th St Apartments on East 11th St. and West 11th St.) as well as ADUs and tend to charge market rate rents for them.

4.2.3.3 Coastal Zone

The California Coastal Commission regulates development on parcels within the Coastal Zone. Such development must comply with the Local Coastal Program, which is approved and adopted by the Coastal Commission. In Guadalupe, approximately 60 acres in the southwestern portion of the City are within the coastal zone. The City annexed this land in 1990 and prepared a local coastal plan (LCP) that California Coastal Commission has certified. Designated uses for the site include a community park, single family residences, open space, and the City's wastewater treatment plant. None of the RHNA-allocated units will be in the coastal zone of the City.

4.2.3.4 Flood Zones

Portions of land northwest of City limits fall within the 100-year and 500-year flood zones. In the past two years, some flooding occurred in low-lying areas of the City that are adjacent to the Santa Maria River. However, Santa Barbara County developed a pilot channel to mitigate and avert further flooding. There is no plan for new development in or near the flood zones.

4.2.3.5 Seismic Faults

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (Public Resources Code Section 2621, et seq.) restricts development on the surface traces of known active faults that are mapped by the State Geologist. No Alquist-Priolo faults are within the City limits. Twenty-one older commercial buildings in the City's downtown core are identified to be of unreinforced masonry construction. The City has been working with owners to seismically upgrade these buildings. Seismic faults do not pose a constraint to housing development in the City.

Figure 4-1: Environmental Constraints Map–Prime Agricultural Lands under Williamson Act Contract




Figure 4-2: Environmental Constraints Map–Floodable Areas





Figure 4-3: Environmental Constraints Map–Wetlands and Habitat Areas



4.2.4 Infrastructure and Public Facilities

The availability of infrastructure and public facilities is important in evaluating the potential of developing additional housing. The following subsections discuss the capacity of such key facilities as water and sewer. Both the City's water and sewage treatment systems are adequate to serve current and future needs.

4.2.4.1 Wastewater System

The City operates a wastewater treatment plant with a sewer capacity of about one million gallons per day. Based on a per capita wastewater generation of 80 gallons per day, the sewer could accommodate a population of about 12,000 residents. The City of Guadalupe completed a Wastewater System and Treatment Master Plan in 2014, which confirmed that the existing and proposed wastewater infrastructure could adequately serve the City's residents over a 20-year planning period. In addition, the study established a plan for future wastewater improvements to accommodate future growth. Table 4-8 shows that sewer capacity will be more than adequate beyond the next eight years, the planning horizon of this Housing Element.

Table 4-8: Sewer Capacity and Projected Sewer Demand

Future Year	Population Projection (Persons)	Gallon Per Person/Day	Total City Usage (Gallons)	Capacity (Gallons)	Percent of Capacity
2030	8,068	80	645,440	966,000	67%
2035	6,427	80	514,160	966,000	53%
2040	9,209	80	736,720	966,000	76%

Sources: City of Guadalupe 2042 General Plan; 2014 Wastewater System and Treatment Master Plan.

4.2.4.2 Water Supply Sources

The Santa Maria Groundwater Basin and the State Water Project are the City's two primary water supply sources. In 1997, the Santa Maria Valley Water Conservation District filed a lawsuit to adjudicate water rights in the Basin (Santa Maria Valley Water Conservation District vs. City of Santa Maria CV 770214, January 11, 2005). In June 2006, the Santa Maria Valley Water Conservation District negotiated a Settlement Agreement with terms and conditions for a solution concerning the overall management of the water resources in the Basin including rights to groundwater use. According to that agreement, Santa Maria, the Golden State Water Company, and the City of Guadalupe have preferential appropriative rights to surplus native groundwater. Therefore, these parties may pump groundwater without limitation unless a severe water shortage condition exists. If a severe water shortage exists, the Court may require these parties to limit their pumping to their respective shares and assigned rights. The Court granted the City of Guadalupe 1,300 acre-feet per year (AFY) of prescriptive rights in the Basin during drought conditions (Santa Maria Valley Water Management Agreement, 2005). The City completed a Water Master Plan Update in 2021, which calculated existing and future water demand within the City. The study confirmed that the existing and proposed water infrastructure could

adequately serve the City's residents over a 20-year planning period. In addition, the study established a plan for future water improvements to accommodate future growth.

The City of Guadalupe retrieves all its water supply from the State Water Project and two wells which tap the Santa Maria Ground Water Basin. The Obispo Tank Well is located just west of Obispo Street near its intersection with Fir Street. The second well is located within the Pasadera Development and has a pumping capacity of 1,000 gpm. There is also a dedicated 12-inch transmission pipeline from the Pasadera Well to the Obispo Tank Site. It should be noted that the City has utilized several other wells in the past, but that those wells have been decommissioned because of water quality and/or operation issues. They include the 9th Street Well, 242 Obispo Well, 5th Street Well, and Tognazinni Well. In addition to the 1,300 acre-feet per year in well water, the City is also entitled to 550 acre-feet per year from the State Water Project. State water is subject to change when the percent annual delivery is revised according to levels of annual rainfall and Sierra Nevada snowpack.

Following the 2021 Water Master Plan Update, the City scheduled its well operations and anticipated state water deliveries to provide approximately 605 AFY of water supply. This reduction in State Water allotment is due in part to continued drought conditions being experienced throughout California. Although state water supply has reduced, the combination of the two sources would be enough to meet demand through the next eight years.

Water quality and supply are limiting factors for growth in cities throughout California; however, Guadalupe has adequate groundwater and State Water Project allocations to accommodate population increase. The Pasadera Development is the primary source of new water demand in Guadalupe, which can be served by the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin through the new Pasadera well and pumping station. The 2042 Guadalupe General Plan calls for incorporation of water conservation measures through the implementation of the State mandated Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance and incorporating Executive Order E-37-16 for existing and new developments. This action could offset some of the new water demand. All indications are that water supply poses no immediate constraint to housing development in Guadalupe.

4.2.5 Short-Term Rentals (STRs)

Short-Term Rentals refer to the right to use or possess a dwelling unit (or portions of a dwelling unit) for residency or lodging purposes over a period of less than 30 consecutive calendar days. The dedication of many dwelling units for short term rentals can exacerbate housing shortage and affect the rental cost of housing.

Section 18.55.060 of the Municipal code comprehensively defines the operating standards and requirements for short term rentals. The City has a minimal number of STRs. *Officially, the City has six registered short-term rentals. That is approximately 0.003 percent of the housing stock. According to the Airbnb site, one whole dwelling unit was advertised for rental while two other properties advertised a room each for rental within the City in mid-June of 2024. Therefore, STRs have not contributed in any substantial way to the City's low vacancy rate compared to other jurisdictions in the region. Thus, STRs pose no potential constraints to the availability of the existing supply of housing for households.*

5.0 Energy Conservation Opportunities

State law requires all new construction to comply with energy conservation standards that establish maximum allowable energy use from non-renewable sources (California Administrative Code, Title 24). These requirements apply to design components such as structural insulation, air infiltration and leakage control, features on thermostats, and water heating system insulation for tanks and pipes. State law also requires that a tentative tract map provide for future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities in the subdivision, including designing the lot sizes and configurations to permit orienting structures to take advantage of a southern exposure, shade or prevailing breezes.

This chapter describes opportunities to conserve energy in residential development, including energy saving design, energy saving materials, and energy efficient systems and features. Areas evaluated include planning and land use as well as energy efficient building practices and technologies. Planning to maximize energy efficiency and the incorporation of energy conservation and green building features can contribute to reduced housing costs for homeowners and renters, in addition to promoting sustainable community design and reduced dependence on vehicles. Such planning and development standards can also reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Chapter 6 on Housing Action Plan provides the goals, policies, and programs for conserving energy in new housing development and retrofits to existing housing in Guadalupe.

5.1 Planning and land Use

The arrangement and compactness of land uses can conserve energy. Land use patterns that separate uses excessively, spread development on the landscape, and promote auto dependency tend to isolate residential areas from commercial uses like grocery stores causing residents to travel long distances to take care of daily shopping and service needs. Alternatively, keeping a balance between jobs and housing within the same community and locating them near each other can help to reduce travel distances, promote use of alternative forms of transportation, and reduce energy use. Long trips necessitate use of the automobile or other mechanical form of movement with attendant gasoline consumption. Short distances promote walking and cycling. Changing the land use pattern therefore can change energy use patterns. The intent of energy-efficient land use planning is to reduce the distances of automobile travel, reduce the costs of construction, and increase the potential for residents to complete shopping and other chores without driving or by driving short distances.

The small, compact nature of Guadalupe and its prevailing land use pattern are inherently energy efficient. The City promotes development on vacant and underutilized lots to assure a compact and contiguous community. According to the Urban Land Institute (ULI), "conserving or developing infill housing within a more urban core has been shown to reduce primary energy consumption an average of 20 percent per household over newer sprawl developments." (ULI, 2008, *Growing Cooler*). Compact development results in secondary energy savings or "embodied energy," which is the term used for the energy spent producing the materials and finished products like sewer pipes, electrical lines, paving materials, and so on. Minimizing the length of necessary water, sewer, and electricity lines consumes less of those products, thereby decreasing the total energy consumption.

The City's compact development also helps promote convenience and accessibility to public transit. Efficient transit service generally requires a minimum of 6 housing units per acre in residential areas (Victoria Transport Policy Institute, 2008). In Guadalupe, the older housing tracts have an average density of 7 to 10 units per acre. The newer Point Sal Dunes development has a density of 6 units per acre. At full buildout, the DJ Farms Specific Plan development will have an overall density of about 6 units per acre while individual residential tracts within the Plan area will have densities ranging from 6 units per acre to 14 units per acre. The residential zones and mixed-use areas near and in the Central Business District (CBD) of Guadalupe have the potential for higher residential densities of 15 to 20 units per acre.

The City promotes mixed-use development, particularly in the core areas of the community and along such major roads as Guadalupe Street (State Route 1) and Main Street (State Route 166). Many residents, however, opt to do grocery and other shopping outside the City because Guadalupe lacks a large grocery store. There are stores within Guadalupe that can take care of daily essentials, but many residents drive to Santa Maria and neighboring communities for shopping.

The 2042 General Plan continues to promote prevailing patterns of compact growth with enhancements in the form of mixed-use development, neighborhood commercial centers, a network of biking and walking paths, and augmentation of public transit stops. Implementation of the Plan can promote use of public transit, reduce vehicle trips to neighboring cities, promote biking and walking, and conserve energy use.

5.2 Energy Efficient Practices and Technologies

Energy usage in housing largely depends on indoor heating and cooling. These in turn depend on the energy efficiency of: (a) the home in terms of material quality and insulation; (b) appliances, which include hot water heaters, dishwashers, washers, and dryers; (c) plumbing fixtures; and (d) mechanical systems within the building. To conserve energy in new housing developments and retrofits, the City should promote or require the use of any of the following practices and technologies:

- Passive solar construction techniques that require proper solar orientation, appropriate levels of thermal mass, south facing windows, and moderate insulation levels;
- Higher insulation levels in place of thermal mass or energy conserving window orientation;
- Active solar water heating in exchange for lower insulation or energy-conserving window treatments;
- Energy-efficient indoor and outdoor lighting, including fluorescent lighting;
- Energy-efficient appliances;
- Drought tolerant landscaping and drip irrigation for landscaping, which reduces the amount of energy needed to pump water;
- Weatherization of windows and doors;
- Individual meters in multi-family units for gas, electricity, and water to promote conservation;
- Photovoltaic systems;

- Deciduous trees to naturally cool buildings, create wind barriers to surrounding areas, and enhance streetscapes to promote walking and bicycling; and
- Green building practices, which incorporate materials and construction practices that reduce a building's energy consumption.

Pacific Gas & Electric provides a variety of energy conservation services for residents and participates in several other energy assistance programs for lower income households, which help qualified homeowners and renters conserve energy and control electricity costs. These programs include the California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) Program and the Relief for Energy Assistance through Community Help (REACH) Program.

The California Alternate Rates for Energy Program (CARE) provides a 15 percent monthly discount on gas and electric rates to income-qualified households, certain non-profits, facilities that house agricultural employees, homeless shelters, hospices and other qualified non-profit group-living facilities.

The REACH Program provides one-time energy assistance to customers who have no other way to pay their energy bills. The intent of REACH is to assist low-income customers, particularly the elderly, disabled people, the sick, the working poor, and the unemployed who experience severe hardships and are unable to pay for their necessary energy needs.

In addition, the State Department of Community Services & Development administers a home weatherization program as part of its Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). This program provides free energy efficiency upgrades to the dwellings of low-income families to help lower their monthly utility bills.

6.0 Housing Action Plan

This chapter provides statements of community goals, policies, programs, and quantified objectives as they relate to the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing in Guadalupe. The framework covers the 2023 to 2031 planning horizon.

6.1 Affordable Housing Supply

Goal 1: An adequate supply of affordable housing for all income levels.

Policies:

Pol-1.1. Designate an adequate number of housing sites for both rent and purchase to accommodate the City's share of regional housing needs for each income classification.

Pol-1.2. Adopt policies, regulations, and procedures that do not add unnecessarily to the cost of housing while still attaining other important City objectives.

Pol-1.3. Give high priority for permit processing to low-income residential projects, and the highest priority for projects that include housing units for extremely low-income households.

Pol-1.4. Continue to support the efforts of the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority in Guadalupe.

Pol-1.5. Apply for funds from the State and Federal governments through the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority or in conjunction with nonprofit or for-profit developers to construct housing for the lower income households.

Pol-1.6. Continue to provide Section 8 assistance to eligible households through the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority.

Pol-1.7. Require dispersal of low-income housing throughout new residential projects instead of concentration into single buildings or single portions of the site to the extent practical given the size of the project and other site constraints.

Pol-1.8. Distribute low-income housing produced through government subsidies, incentives, or regulatory programs throughout the City rather than concentrate them in particular areas or neighborhoods.

Pol-1.9. Require low-income housing units in density bonus projects to be available at the same time as the market-rate units in the development.

Pol-1.10. Designate locations where adequate facilities are available for the development of multi-family dwellings if such development is consistent with neighborhood character.

Pol-1.11. Allow rehabilitation of legal, non-conforming dwellings that do not meet requirements for lot size, setbacks, and other zoning standards if the non-conformity does not increase and there is no threat to public health or safety.

Pol-1.12. Offer financial incentives, financial assistance, or regulatory concessions for projects that develop housing for extremely low-income households such as single-room occupancy units.

Programs:

Prg-1.1. Evaluate annually the adequacy of services and facilities for additional residential development; identify service deficiencies and costs as well as priorities for correcting them. Create and maintain an up-to-date inventory of vacant and underutilized parcels.

Responsibility: City Administrator

Timeframe: Ongoing with an annual update report

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Annual progress and priority reports submitted to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) in compliance with State law.

Prg-1.2. Maintain priority water and sewer service procedures for developments with units that are affordable to lower income households.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Priority water and service procedures

Prg-1.3. Enforce the new zoning ordinance that complies with California State law, which allows accessory dwelling units, mobile and manufactured homes, licensed residential care facilities and group homes rental housing, and transitional and supportive housing in all residential zone districts. **Amend zoning and permit procedures to permit group homes for six or fewer persons (regardless of licensing) as single family uses and permit group homes for seven or more persons (regardless of licensing) in all zones allowing residential uses only subject to requirements of other residential uses of the same type in the same zone. Continue to revise the City’s ADU ordinance in compliance with state law if needed and within six months of modifications to state law.** Subject these uses to the development and management standards that apply to residential development within the same zones. Implement the revised Zoning Ordinance that meet all requirements under State ADU Law. Foster ADU development through the pursuit of funding biennially, establishment of prototype plans, and modifications to development standards (e.g., heights, unit size, etc.) beyond ADU Law. Promote **annually** the use of ADUs through public awareness campaigns and dissemination of informational materials to property owners, builders, and developers.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: immediately, but within two years into new Housing Element

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Zoning Ordinance Amendment within two years or by 2026

Prg-1.4. Require a 55-year continued affordability condition for projects that receive a density bonus together with government funds. Also, require at least 20 years of continued affordability to projects

that are awarded density bonuses but do not use government funds. Monitor projects built under all options for compliance with State density bonus laws.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Zoning Ordinance Amendment

Prg-1.5. Team with the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority, People's Self-Help Housing Corporation, or other non-profit agencies to secure funds through State and Federal programs for development of new low-income housing, rehabilitation, and room additions to relieve overcrowding among low-income households. Prioritize opportunities for the development of housing for extremely low-income households to meet the City's housing allocation in this RHNA cycle. Coordinate with the County and provide letters of support and technical support to nonprofits in seeking new funding. Participate in the Housing Trust Fund of Santa Barbara County to leverage the City's resources. Expedite the processing of density bonus applications which include affordable housing. And provide a report annually to the City Council on progress in this endeavor.

Responsibility: City Administrator

Timeframe: (1) Meet with the Santa Barbara Housing Authority, the Self-Help Housing Corporation, and other non-profit agencies at least once a year;

(2) Submit funding applications to these agencies annually;

(3) Report to the City Council in December of every year.

(4) Expedite processing of density bonus applications continuously.

Funding: Various Housing Development Funds

Expected Outcome: Secured annual funding and support for construction of low-income housing

Prg-1.6. Continue code enforcement efforts to preserve the City's housing stock. Continue the City's Home Rehabilitation Program by applying annually for grants such as the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and providing annual loan programs (based on available funds) to low-income homeowners

Responsibility: City Administrator

Timeframe: Ongoing with annual reports

Funding: Santa Barbara County Housing and Community Development Department

Expected Outcome: Annual data reports & Development of low-income housing

Prg-1.7. Add regulations to permit the development of affordable, multi-family housing on small sites (e.g., less than a half-acre) offering incentives beyond State Density Bonus Law (GC Section 65915)

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: within 2 years in preparation for next RHNA cycle

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Zoning Ordinance Amendment

Prg-1.8. As per SB 2 and AB 2339 requirements, amend the definition of emergency shelters, establish appropriate development standards, and revise the zoning code by 2025 to allow emergency shelters in all zones that permit housing without requirements for design review permits and discretionary actions as the design review decision-making criteria. In conformance with AB 139, provide sufficient parking to accommodate staff working at emergency shelters, provided that the standards do not require more parking for emergency shelters than other residential or commercial uses within the same zone. In conformance with AB 101, specifically define low barrier navigation centers (LBNCs) as a permitted use type of emergency shelters and allow emergency shelters in all zones that permit housing including defining LBNCs without requirements for design review permits and discretionary actions as the design review decision-making criteria. In addition, amend the zoning ordinance to permit manufactured single-family homes by right in R-3 zones. Ensure manufactured homes that are built on a permanent foundation are allowed in the same manner and in the same zones as conventional or stick-built structures.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Immediately, but within two years into new Housing Element

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Zoning Ordinance Amendment within two years or by 2026

Prg-1.9. Modify the subdivision ordinance by 2025 to establish written procedures to grant priority water and sewer services to developments with units affordable to lower-income households.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Immediately, but within two years into new Housing Element

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Amendment to Subdivision Ordinance within two years or by 2026

Prg-1.10. Further foster the production of affordable housing through an update to the City's zoning code to implement Senate Bill 9 (SB 9) requirements. Support property owners willing to pursue lot splits and duplexes with accessible web information on the qualifying conditions and an abbreviated approval process.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Immediately, but within two years into new Housing Element

Funding: Community Development Block Grant, other sources of grant funds, and development impact fees.

Expected Outcome: Zoning Ordinance Amendment within two years or by 2026

Prg-1.11. Unshackle and speed up housing production through updates to the City's zoning code to implement Senate Bill 35 (SB 35) and Senate Bill 300 (SB 330) requirements. Streamline regulatory requirements, reduce permit processing delays, and reduce or defer impact and service fees that delay production of housing, particularly for already planned projects of residential (non-commercial) units, mixed uses that combine residential and non-residential uses, as well as transitional and supportive housing. And protect existing inventories of housing.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Immediately, but within two years into new Housing Element

Funding: General fund.

Expected Outcome: Zoning Ordinance Amendment within two years or by 2026

Prg-1.12. Amend the zoning ordinance to permit manufactured single-family homes by right in R-3 zones. Ensure manufactured homes that are built on a permanent foundation are allowed in the same manner and in the same zones as conventional or stick-built structures.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Immediately, but within two years into new Housing Element

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Zoning Ordinance Amendment within two years or by 2026

6.2 Conservation and Rehabilitation

Goal 2: Conservation and rehabilitation of the City's existing stock of affordable housing.

Policies:

Pol-2.1. Refer all requests for the funding of rehabilitation projects or the construction of new affordable housing projects to review by the Santa Barbara County Housing and Community Development Department.

Pol-2.2. Continue to coordinate with the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority to maintain Section 8 rent subsidies.

Pol-2.3. Apply for funds, including CDBG grants, for the purpose of rehabilitating low cost, owner occupied and rental housing.

Pol-2.4. Promote private financing of the rehabilitation of housing.

Pol-2.5. Require the abatement of unsafe structures, while giving property owners ample time to correct deficiencies. Provide relocation assistance to residents displaced by such abatement.

Pol-2.6. Allow the demolition of existing multi-family housing only when: (a) the structure is found to be substandard and unsuitable for rehabilitation; (b) relocation assistance is available to tenants with reasonable notice; (c) tenants could purchase the replacement property, if for sale.

Programs:

Prg-2.1. Coordinate the City's efforts with the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority to continue receiving Section 8 subsidy funds.

Responsibility: City Administrator

Timeframe: Ongoing with annual tallies

Funding: Planning Department budget

Expected Outcome: Maintenance of existing Section 8 subsidies plus annual tallies

6.3 At-Risk Units

Goal 3: Preservation of at-risk units in Guadalupe.

Policies:

Pol-3.1. Strive to preserve all at-risk dwelling units in the City.

Pol-3.2. Require at least three years notice and again six months' notice to the City, HCD, the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority, and residents of at-risk units prior to the conversion of any units for low-income households to market rate under any of the following circumstances:

- The units were constructed with the aid of government funding
- The units were required by an inclusionary zoning ordinance
- The project was granted a density bonus
- The project received other incentives

Programs:

Prg-3.1. Coordinate with the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority to maintain a list of all dwellings within the City that are subsidized by government funding or are low-income housing developed through regulations or incentives. At a minimum, the list should include the number of units, type of government program, and the date at which the units could convert to market-rate dwellings

Responsibility: City Administrator

Timeframe: Ongoing with annual lists

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: List of subsidized or incentivized housing by year

Prg-3.2. Add to existing incentive programs, and include in all new incentive or regulatory programs, requirements to give notice prior to conversion to market rate units.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Ongoing with annual update reports

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Revised housing incentive and regulatory programs

Prg-3.3. Coordinate with the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority and non-profit organization of affordable home developers like People's Self-help and establish specific time parameters around actions to preserve the 18 at-risk units in Point Sal Dune to prevent them from conversion to market rate units by reinstating the covenant for Point Sal Dunes units at the end of its term in 2030 and modifying it to become permanent as most of the other assisted units are in the City. Require at least three years notice and again six months' notice to the City, HCD, the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority, and residents of at-risk units prior to the conversion of any units for low-income households to market rate under any of the following circumstances:

- The units were constructed with the aid of government funding
- The units were required by an inclusionary zoning ordinance
- The project was granted a density bonus
- The project received other incentives

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Ongoing with annual update reports

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Addition to the permanently subsidized housing stock

6.4 Special Needs

Goal 4: Adequate housing for special needs groups in Guadalupe, including farmworkers, people with disabilities, and large families.

Policies:

Pol-4.1. Promote the development of housing for farmworkers and large families.

Pol-4.2. Remove housing restraints for those with disabilities as outlined in Senate Bill 520 (Chapter 671 California Code).

Pol-4.3. Disseminate information about housing opportunities and services in the area to migrant farmworkers.

Programs:

Prg-4.1. Amend the zoning ordinance by 2025 to grant density bonuses in conformance with Chapter 16.97 of the State Density Bonus law, or exemption from the in-lieu fee requirement, or both, for projects that include three-and four-bedroom units, or single room occupancy units, as significant components of the projects. Determine the thresholds for the qualifying number of such units and exact size of the density increase or fee exemption in the drafting of the ordinance but based on affordable housing needs. Peg the period of affordability for the qualifying units at 55 years or more.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: 2025 with ongoing implementation

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Zoning ordinance amendment for special needs housing

Prg-4.2. Adopt a procedure for making reasonable accommodations in the form of modifications or exceptions in zoning laws and other land use regulations and practices when such accommodations may be necessary to afford persons with disabilities and other special needs (including group homes) equal opportunity to use and enjoy housing. Include in the amendment a revised definition of family that is consistent with State housing law. The regulation should address all aspects of the Americans with Disabilities Act that relate to home construction, retrofitting, and parking requirements. And address financial incentives for housing developers who address SB 520 issues in new construction and in retrofitting existing homes.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Fall 2025

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Zoning ordinance amendment for special needs housing

Prg-4.3. Continue to disseminate information in both English and Spanish about housing opportunities and services for homeless persons and migrant farmworkers through the Police Department and City Hall.

Responsibility: City Administrator, Police Department, and Planning Department

Timeframe: Annually

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Continually updated information on special needs housing

Prg-4.4. Cooperate biennially with Santa Barbara County and other agencies in the development of programs aimed at providing affordable, multi-family housing, including housing for families with special needs. As part of this cooperation, identify sites biennially that could support affordable multi-family housing development and consult with the site owners or housing partners on the feasibility of developing the sites for affordable housing.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: within two years in preparation for next RHNA cycle

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Coordination and development of affordable, multi-family housing.

Prg-4.5. Amend multi-family residential and mixed-use areas to permit emergency, transitional, low-barrier navigation centers, and supportive housing as residential uses by right, subject only to those regulations that apply to other residential dwellings of the same type in the same zones. Establish “by-right” approval provisions in zoning for multi-family districts particularly when accommodating groups with special housing needs. And streamline processing procedures.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: within a year

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome. New ordinance on transitional housing

Prg-4.6. Adopt by 2025 priority processing, granting of fee waivers or deferrals, modifying development standards, granting concessions, and offering incentives (beyond State Density Bonus Law) for housing developments that include units affordable to extremely low-income households or farmworkers. Assist and support the pursuit of funding applications, outreach, and coordination with affordable housing developers to biennially identify development opportunities and coordinate with farmworkers, employers, and other related organizations in expanding housing for extremely low-income and farmworker households.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Within two years in conformity with the new RHNA cycle

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Coordination and development of affordable, multi-family housing.

Prg-4.7. Amend zoning ordinance by 2025 to address reasonable accommodations for group homes by making amendments to zoning and permit procedures to permit group homes for six or fewer persons (regardless of licensing) as single family uses and permit group homes for seven or more persons (regardless of licensing) in all zones allowing residential uses only subject to requirements of other residential uses of the same type in the same zone. Although group homes operating as single-family residences that provide licensable services to more than six residents may be subject to conditional use or other discretionary approval processes, the State recommends that local governments provide flexible and efficient reasonable accommodations in these permitting processes. This means that some requests for exceptions to permitting processes should be resolved through reasonable accommodation procedures instead of conditional use procedures. In addition, any substantive requirements for these group homes must still comply with the local government’s obligations to remove constraints on housing for persons with disabilities, affirmatively support it, and prevent discrimination against it.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Fall 2025

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Zoning ordinance amendment for reasonable accommodations

Prg-4.8. Update the City’s municipal code by 2025 to address and comply with key statutory requirements of the Health and Safety Code: (a) Section 17021.6 of the Code requires that employee housing consisting of no more than 12 units or 36 beds are permitted in the same manner as other agricultural uses (not multifamily) in zones that allow agricultural uses. (b) Section 17021.8 of the Code requires that eligible agricultural employee housing development be subject to a streamlined, ministerial approval process and not be subject to a conditional use permit (CUP).

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Fall 2025

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Zoning ordinance amendment for employee (including agricultural) housing.

Prg-4.9. Update the City’s municipal code by 2025 to replace the definition of “family” as “one or more persons living together as a single housekeeping unit in a dwelling unit.”

Responsibility: Planning Department *Timeframe:* Fall 2025

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Removal of constraint on housing for persons with disabilities.

6.5 Energy Conservation

Goal 5: Energy efficient housing units that result in reduced energy costs to Guadalupe residents.

Policies:

Pol-5.1. Require new dwelling units to meet State requirements for energy efficiency and retrofits to existing units to meet similar standards.

Pol-5.2. Reorganize land use patterns proactively for energy efficiency.

Programs:

Prg-5.1. Continue to implement Title 24 of the California Code on new developments

Responsibility: Building Department

Timeframe: 2025 with ongoing implementation

Funding: General Fund with fees for plan reviews and building inspections

Expected Outcome. Implementation of Title 24

Prg-5.2. Coordinate with PG&E to involve residents in energy efficiency retrofit programs. Conduct outreach on energy awareness programs in conjunction with PG&E to educate residents about the benefits of various retrofit programs.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: 2025 with ongoing implementation

Funding: General Fund and PG&E

Expected Outcome. Increased awareness of and participation in energy efficiency programs

Prg-5.3. Amend the subdivision ordinance to require orientation of subdivisions for solar access.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: 2025 with ongoing implementation

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome. Subdivision Ordinance amendment

Prg-5.4. Apply biennially for and support applications for affordable housing funds from agencies that reward and incentivize good planning. Examples include the HCD's Multifamily Housing Program (MHP) and California Tax Credit Allocation Committee resources which provide competitive advantage for affordable infill housing and affordable housing built close to jobs, transportation, and amenities.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Biennially

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome. Smart growth of the City

Prg-5.5. Partner with public utility districts and private energy companies to promote free energy audits for low-income owners and renters, rebate programs for installing energy efficient features and appliances and public education about ideas to conserve energy.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: 2025 with ongoing implementation

Funding: Various sources

Expected Outcome. Reduction in per capita energy use

Prg-5.6. Adopt Sustainable Design Guidelines, which give guidance on sustainable design principles such as sustainable energy usage, water conservation, and utilization of reusable building materials.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Within two years in conformity with the new RHNA cycle

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Sustainable Design Guidelines

6.6 Equal Opportunity Housing

Goal 6: Equal access to sound, affordable housing for all persons regardless of race, creed, age or sex.

Policies:

Pol-6.1. Strive to achieve equal access to sound and affordable housing for all persons regardless of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, family status, source of income, or disability.

Pol-6.2. Enforce the policies of the State Fair Employment and Housing Commission.

Programs:

Prg-6.1. Continue to provide information in English and Spanish from the Housing Authority and Department of Equal Housing and Employment about housing and tenant rights in City Hall.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Annually

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome. Readily available information about equal opportunity to housing

Prg-6.2. Cooperate with neighboring jurisdictions and local organizations that sponsor workshops on fair housing laws and how those who are victims of discrimination can address their grievances including referrals of persons experiencing discrimination in housing for legal assistance.

Responsibility: All City Departments

Timeframe: Annually

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome. Minimization of housing discrimination

Prg-6.3. Notify stakeholders such as People's Self-Help Housing Corporation, Santa Barbara County Housing Authority, California Rural legal Assistance, and churches as well as post notices at public venues prior to public meetings for amendments or updates to the housing element.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Prior to public meetings and in conjunction with other planning efforts

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome. Awareness of Housing Element updates and increased participation

Prg-6.4. Amend the zoning code to permit 3-story and 4-story structures in areas designated for multifamily housing. Notify and collaborate with such stakeholders as People's Self-Help Housing Corporation and the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority as well as post notices at public venues prior to public meetings about the amendments and create information materials for dissemination to other developers.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: within a year

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome. Flexibility and attractiveness of multifamily housing sites for production of affordable units

Prg-6.5. Evaluate the municipal code on the design review permit process and amend to include refinement of design guidelines that establish objective design standards and define required findings on terms like “compatibility” and “harmony” to reduce subjectivity and thereby address potential constraints or impacts on certainty about the City’s expectations on design.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: within a year

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome. Lower subjectivity of officials and uncertainty to stakeholders about expectations of the City for design review

Prg-6.6. Continue the City’s Fair Housing Program with preparation and distribution of a pamphlet on the subject of “Fair Housing and People’s Rights.”

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: 2025 with ongoing implementation

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome. Flexibility and attractiveness of multifamily housing sites for production of affordable units

Prg-6.7. Begin record keeping on complaints and enforcement cases related to fair housing.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: 2025 with ongoing implementation

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome. Records of annual complaints and enforcement cases related to fair housing.

Prg-6.8. Encourage the development of higher-income housing in the downtown as a way of fostering mixed-income housing in the downtown area by offering incentives in the form of density bonuses, regulatory concessions, and fast-tracking of development applications, which have at least 50 percent mixed-income levels to property owners and developers for the re-development of non-vacant sites downtown. Also, conduct outreach annually to inform developers of the opportunity.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: 2025 with ongoing implementation

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Mixed-income housing in the downtown area that fosters Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH).

Prg-6.9. Amend the municipal code to drop the “two-story” restriction and enable development of three-story structures within the 35-foot height limit in R-1, R-2, and R-3 districts.

Responsibility: Planning Department

Timeframe: Within two years into the new Housing Element

Funding: General Fund

Expected Outcome: Additional flexibility with building height in municipal code.

Prg-6.10. The City shall take the following actions to encourage place-based revitalization and improve access to resources and opportunities Citywide, but with a particular emphasis on neighborhoods with a concentration of lower-income residents who often face additional barriers in accessing resources, such as the Area of High Poverty:

- Support infrastructure expansion projects that can benefit residents across multiple income groups. This should include completion of at least the following two projects during the planning period:
 - Construction of the bridges over the Santa Maria Valley Railroad (SMVRR) by late 2025 will enable the crossing over the tracks to build out the Pasadera project with an additional 400 homes and parks.
 - Complete the Transit Hub improvement project at the Amtrak Station by 2025. This will include a complete facelift to the Hub along with charging stations, bathrooms, etc. at the cost of \$1.3M.
- Prioritize projects that facilitate place-based revitalization through the City’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and budget, such as projects that improve public infrastructure in underserved areas to the northwest and the town center. During the planning period, complete the following:
 - Begin construction of the Central Park Renovation project in Summer 2025. The park will include room for botchy ball, skatepark, amphitheater, open space, bathrooms, etc. at the cost of \$5M.
 - Obtain funding approval from the USDA to improve Leroy Park Phase II, put bids, and complete construction improvements by January 2026. This project consists of a 2,200 sq/ft addition to the existing Le Roy Park facility for recreational purposes at the cost of \$1.7M.
- Finalize existing projects in the Capital Improvement Plan centered on street and sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to, repaving of parking lots, roads identified as “Poor”

or “Failed”, and connecting sidewalks identified as “inconsistent”, particularly those identified in the Areas of Poverty including:

- Construction of the Leroy Park Parking Lot Improvements to begin early in 2025. This is to replace the existing gravel surface with asphalt at the cost of \$130k.
- Support growth by increasing community services and amenities. The City shall execute the Capital Improvement Plan by completing projects that promote community cohesion including:
 - The Historic Royal Theater
 - Construction of the City Hall Courtyard Basketball Court/Pickleball Court at the cost of \$80k in 2025.
- Facilitate place-based revitalization and promote healthy environments for new or newly-constructed housing by implementing bikeways, trains, sidewalk, and intersection improvements to promote active transportation. Apply for funding from programs such as the Active Transportation Program, Safe Routes to School, Highway Safety Improvement Program, or other similar programs as notices of funding availability (NOFAs) are available, at least once per year. Complete an average of one active transportation or street improvement a year, including:
 - Complete the construction of the large community and health services center at Escalante Meadows by 2025. This facility will house early childhood development, medical services, and recreational programs at the cost of \$12M.
- Promote commercial opportunities in the City in conjunction with new development including:
 - Concluding negotiations during the planning period with a private developer to bring a full service grocery store to the City.
- Evaluate the effects of emissions from agricultural industries and traffic by December 2026 and implement at least one project during the planning period to mitigate negative environmental effects.
- Work with the Santa Maria Area Transit (SMAT) to increase awareness of available transit options. The City will meet with Santa Maria Area Transit at least twice during the planning period to strategize how best to reach at least 50 residents with this information.
- Meet with school district representatives by December 2026 to analyze whether housing security poses a barrier to student achievement. As affordable projects are completed, require developers to coordinate with the school district to market households to teachers or other school employees (not including projects that are exclusive to senior residents) with the goal of connecting at least 5 district households with affordable housing opportunity. In addition, work with the school district to assist them in securing grant funding for teacher recruitments and

other incentives for teachers to facilitate positive learning environments citywide. During the planning period, complete construction of a new middle school in the Pasadera neighborhood by 2026. This will enable conversion of the old middle school to a second elementary school, which will alleviate overcrowding in the existing elementary school.

Responsibility: Planning Department, Public Works, Administrative Division/City Grant Writer

Timeframe: Several timeframes, listed individually

Funding: General Fund and grant funding

Expected Outcome. Increase place-based strategies throughout the City, focusing on High Poverty neighborhoods.

6.7 Quantified Objectives

Table 6-1 presents an estimate of the number of units to be constructed by income level during the planning period from 2023 to 2031. The quantified objectives do not represent ceilings on development but rather set target goals for the City to achieve based on needs, resources and constraints. The target of 431 total units is a steep increase from the 50 units in the 2014-2022 cycle presumably because of Guadalupe's potential to deliver a good number of housing units to serve the region.

Table 6-1 reveals that not only did Guadalupe fully meet its allocation for the 5th Cycle but exceeded it substantially for the income categories of very low, moderate, and above moderate. Appendix A has additional details on building permits and accomplishments in housing construction in Guadalupe.

Table 6-1 also shows that if the excess of 354 housing units completed in the 5th Cycle were counted toward Guadalupe's allocation for the 6th Cycle plus the 324 other units anticipated to be completed mostly in the Pasadera development over the period, then over 678 total housing units are expected in the 6th Cycle. This number exceeds the 6th Cycle allocation of 431 units by more than 50 percent overall. The one exception is the "low-income" category for which the excess in the "very low" category would almost make up the difference. Additionally, ADU activity in Guadalupe over the recent four-year period between November 2019 and November 2023 spiked to include 53 completely constructed units. At this rate, Guadalupe produced approximately a dozen ADUs per year on average, which can contribute to the RHNA in the lower income categories. However, ADU activity has accelerated in recent years. For instance, final records showed that the City processed 38 building permit applications for ADUs and issued 26 occupancy clearances for ADUs during calendar year 2023. Therefore, applications for ADUs accounted for over 57 percent of the total applications for new housing during the year. Table 6-2 shows the quantified housing objectives for the upcoming 2023-2031 cycle. The quantified objectives do not represent ceilings on development but rather set target goals for the City to achieve based on needs, resources and constraints.

Table 6-1: Comparison of RHNA Allocations Met and Unmet by Income Groups in Guadalupe

Income Category	5 th Cycle RHNA Allocation	Total Completed in 5 th Cycle	Balance from 5 th Cycle	Pending Construction	Total Potential in 6 th Cycle	6 th Cycle RHNA Allocation
	RHNA Allocation		Applicable to 6 th Cycle			RHNA Allocation
Extremely low	5	6	1	0	1	1
Very Low	7	27	20	0	20	2
Low	8	8	0	0	0	24
Moderate	13	154	141	40	181	77
Above Moderate	17	209	192	284	476	327
Total	50	404	354	324	678	431

Sources: City of Guadalupe Planning Department; SBCAG, 2014-2022 & 2023-2031 RHNA Allocations.

Table 6-2: Quantified Housing Need in Guadalupe for 2023-2031 Cycle

Income Category	2023 - 2031 Regional Housing Allocation	Housing Rehabilitation Objectives	Housing Conservation Objectives	New Construction Objective
Extremely Low	1	2	5	40
Very low	2	3	5	40
Low	24	3	6	20
Moderate	77	12		77
Above Moderate	327	34		327
Total	431	54	16	504

6.8 Furthering Fair Housing

6.8.1 Contributing Factors

A contributing factor is defined as something that creates, contributes to, perpetuates, or increases the severity of one or more fair housing issues. Contributing factors must be prioritized based on the AFFH analysis, with highest priority given to factors that limit or deny fair housing choice, access to opportunities, or civil rights.

In any given community, there are multiple contributing factors – the key is to prioritize those that are most relevant and important and ensure they are linked to goals. Based on the AFFH analysis and local data and knowledge, the City of Guadalupe has identified and prioritized the following contributing factors:

- Limited public and private investments in education, workforce development, and public transportation
- Somewhat limited resources and investments targeting fair housing choices for farmworkers and female-headed households
- Limited accessibility to sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, and other infrastructure
- Limited resources for fair housing agencies and organizations

The City is prioritizing its AFFH actions toward the identified contributing factors, with specific emphasis on place-based strategies toward community revitalization in the older parts of town including the downtown and Gularte Tract. The City is also continues to prioritize housing mobility strategies and affordable housing in newer and redeveloping areas of the City.

Actions in Program 6.10 and those additionally enumerated in Table 6-3 prioritize the City's areas of higher need and most vulnerable populations, including farmworkers and female-headed households. These actions include, but are not limited to, the preservation of existing affordable housing, fair housing outreach, and displacement protections.

6.8.2 Implementation Actions to Further Fair Housing

Table 6-3 summarizes the City's implementation actions to further fair housing under the following five themes:

- Fair housing outreach and enforcement
- Tenant protection and anti-displacement
- New opportunities in high resource areas
- Housing mobility through expanded choices in housing types and locations
- Place-based strategies for neighborhood improvements

It is noteworthy that some of the fair housing actions in Table 6-3 reflect initiatives that are not explicitly listed among the housing-specific policies of the Housing Element (sections 6.1 through 6.6) but support the goal of affirmatively furthering fair housing. Fair Housing Analysis in Appendix C includes discussions of these supportive initiatives.

The following are also noteworthy about the contents of the AFFH Matrix:

1. *Many AFFH programs and commitments are aspirational.*
2. *Some are legacy programs that would always be necessary.*
3. *Few (if any) can be specific to any one cycle only.*

Table 6-3: AFFH Action Matrix for 2023-2031

ID	Program	Specific Commitment(s)	Timeline	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
FAIR HOUSING OUTREACH AND ENFORCEMENT					
1	Information Dissemination Prg-1.3 Prg-6.1 Prg-6.3 Prg-6.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organize regular community events on housing Prepare and disseminate handouts in English and Spanish Post materials in multiple public places and distribute to community-based organizations 	Annually	Citywide (including library, recreation centers, City Hall, at community events), prioritizing areas with greatest housing needs	25% increase in inquiries about fair housing
2	Public Engagement Prg-6.2 Prg-6.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hold workshops on Fair Housing Conduct outreach to multiple vulnerable groups on Fair Housing Revise Notice of Tenant Rights Make available materials on “Fundamentals of Housing” Expand information online about Fair Housing 			
3	Fair Housing Program Administration Prg-1.5 Pol-2.3	Direct CDBG funds to administer a fair housing program that includes counseling, complaint investigation, technical assistance, & enforcement	2024-2025 onwards	Citywide	
4	Affirmative Marketing of Housing Opportunities Pol-4.3 Prg-4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require development applicants to submit Affirmative Action Marketing Plans 	2024-2025 onwards	Citywide	For every below-market-rate (BMR) housing opportunity, at least 30% of outreach should

ID	Program	Specific Commitment(s)	Timeline	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
	Prg-4.6 Pol-6.2 Prg-6.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require awardees to provide project demographics and affirmative marketing plans for annual reporting 			target lower income households
		Identify a contractor with expertise in affirmative marketing to administer the below-market-rate (BMR) rental program	2024-2025 onwards	Citywide	
TENANT PROTECTION AND ANTI-DISPLACEMENT					
5	Just Cause for Eviction Pol-2.6 Pol-6.2 Prg-6.2	Meet with tenant advocacy organizations to understand issues and gaps. Maintain an open channel of communication. Review and revise regulations as needed to ensure that they are achieving desired outcomes Work with landlords to provide support for tenants in cases of “no fault” evictions	Annually/ongoing Every three years, starting in 2024-2025 Annually/ongoing	Citywide Citywide Citywide, especially in rental housing neighborhoods	Adopted and/or revised tenant protection strategies Eligible tenants receive required notice and relocation assistance

ID	Program	Specific Commitment(s)	Timeline	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop internal process and train staff to implement an Opportunity Zone Relocation Assistance Ordinance Evaluate and regulate buyout practices Expand Opportunity Zone Relocation Assistance to other low-income neighborhoods 	2024-2025 onwards	Low-income neighborhoods with large renter populations	<p>Eligible tenants receive required notice and relocation assistance</p> <p>City establishes regulations for buyout agreements between landlords and tenants</p>
		Evaluate relocation assistance policies, including to ensure payment amounts match cost of living	Every three years	Citywide	Eligible tenants receive required payment amounts that match cost of living
6	Tenant Protection Measures Pol-2.6 Prg-6.1	Convene stakeholders to provide input, review existing measures, and provide recommendations to the City Council	Begin outreach in 2024 Adopt/revise strategies in 2025	Citywide, with focus on areas with concentrations of affordable housing units	Adopted and/or revised tenant protection strategies
7	Periodic Housing Inspection Program Prg-5.1	Inspect rental units in buildings with 3 units or more within the City at least once every 5 years	Every five years	Citywide	Regular inspection of rental units in buildings with 3 or more units
		Increase the frequency of inspections for properties that have more than one reported and verified violation in a year for 10% of units and extended noncompliance	2025 and every 2 years	Citywide	All properties with 1+ verified violation and extended noncompliance for 10% of units are inspected at least every 2 years

ID	Program	Specific Commitment(s)	Timeline	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
8	Code Enforcement Program Prg-1.5 Prg-6.7	Respond within two business days of receiving a complaint from a landlord or tenant. If necessary, schedule a site visit within two business days.	Starting in 2024	Citywide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 90% of all violations not requiring a permit are corrected within 30 days 90% of all violations requiring a permit are corrected within 6 months
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain staff in the Code Enforcement Division who speak Spanish; continue to support efforts by staff to use Spanish Post information in English and Spanish in libraries and other public places, especially in the City’s lowest income neighborhoods, about how to reach Code Enforcement and the services they provide Pilot weekly walk-in hours in low-income/affordable housing neighborhoods so that tenants can easily access code enforcement officers in-person to inquire about potential violations 	2024-2025 onwards	Low-income/affordable housing neighborhoods	<p>Increase inquiries/contact with low-income/affordable housing residents to 20 per week;</p> <p>90% of respondents rate service as good or excellent</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administer real-time satisfaction surveys 			
9	Funding for Affordable Housing	Support local application for preservation pilot funding from Housing Finance Agency of area’s council of government	2025	Citywide, with emphasis on low-income/affordable	At least half a dozen units preserved through preservation pilot funding program

ID	Program	Specific Commitment(s)	Timeline	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
	Prg-1.2, Prg-1.4 Pol-2.1			housing neighborhoods	
10	Preservation of At-Risk Housing Pol-3.1, Pol-3.2 Prg-1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor potential affordability expirations and contact nonprofit property owners to address any future loss of funding that may put these units at risk Explore ways to ensure continued affordability for below-market-rate units in market-rate developments Monitor the status of mobile home parks. In the event of a sale, alert nonprofit partners who may be interested in purchasing. 	2024-2025 onwards	Citywide	Preserve 100% of at-risk rental units Preserve 100% of below-market-rate rental units Preserve 100% of mobile home park units
NEW OPPORTUNITIES IN HIGH RESOURCE AREAS					
11	Funding for Affordable Housing Prg-1.2, Prg-1.4 Pol-2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pursue funding every two years for affordable housing Work with community-based organizations, the County, philanthropy, and other jurisdictions to identify and pursue funds for affordable housing 	2024-2025 onwards	Citywide	By 2031, contribute local funding towards at least 50 units of housing for lower income households By 2031, secure grants totaling at least \$500,000 for housing-related services
12	Pro-Housing City Designation Pol-2.3	Apply for HCD's Pro-Housing City designation and associated financial benefits	2024-2025 onwards	Citywide	
13	Affordable Housing Requirements for Residential and Commercial Development Prg-1.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopt updated commercial linkage fees that align with other jurisdictions in the County Evaluate the success of the policy changes for residential projects and propose adjustments as needed 	2024-2025 onwards 2025-2026 onwards	Citywide	By 2031, produce at least 100 below-market-rate units (25% of RHNA) through proactive

ID	Program	Specific Commitment(s)	Timeline	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use housing site list as a marketing and informational tool when meeting with prospective residential developers 			
17	By Right Development Along Commercial Corridors Prg-4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and publish list of commercial corridors and sites located along commercial corridors that could be prime for by right development under AB 2011 [Assembly Bill 2011 (AB 2011) is the California law that became effective on July 1, 2023, which allows a streamlined ministerial approval process and in some cases increased height limits and relaxed density limits for eligible residential developments in certain commercial zones.] Contact property owners to advise them of the opportunity and provide technical assistance to those interested 	2025	Commercial corridors (i.e., Highway 1 corridor of Downtown, which is only a two-lane, two-way road, which cannot be widened because existing development prevents widening)	By 2031, construct at least 20 units on corridor sites
18	Lot Splits and Duplexes Prg-1.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update website with information on SB 9 Provide expanded FAQs/ how-to guide and fact sheets to explain SB 9 and identify various scenarios for adding housing units Include fair housing fact sheet in SB 9 applications 	2024-2025 onwards	Single-family neighborhoods	Create 10 new units through SB 9 applications to get the ball rolling
19	Housing on Institutional and Religious Properties Pol-4.1 Prg-4.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct outreach to schools and religious institutions Provide technical support to those owners who are interested in developing housing 	2025	Citywide	By 2031, develop at least 10 multi-family housing units on institution-owned properties
20	Review of Development Fees and Waiver/Deferral Policies Prg-4.6	Review and update the master fee schedule to reduce fee burdens for affordable housing projects, where possible	2024-2025 onwards	Citywide	Achieve RHNA targets for below market rate housing

ID	Program	Specific Commitment(s)	Timeline	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
21	Affordable Housing Incentives Prg-4.6, 6.8, 6.10	Implement State and local density bonus programs, including allowances for additional height and concessions and waivers to development standards for projects with affordable housing	2024-2025 onwards	Citywide	Achieve RHNA targets for below market rate housing
22	Incentives for Lot Consolidation Prg-4.6, 6.8	Develop tools to facilitate the consolidation of small lots into larger, more developable sites, including a voluntary merger process that allows two parcels to be combined into a single one.	2026-2027	Citywide, especially in Downtown	Create 10 units on consolidated lots
23	Streamlining of Development Approval Prg-4.5, 4.6, 6.8	Implement measures to streamline the development approval process	2024-2025 onwards	Citywide	Reduce time required between project proposal and project entitlement by 60 to 90 days
24	Water and Sewer Priority Prg-1.2, 1.9	Adopt a policy resolution recommending that housing affordable to low- and very low- income households or possibly all residential projects receive priority for new water and sewer connections in the event of future service limitations	2024-2025 onwards	Citywide	Achieve RHNA targets
25	Zoning Text and Map Revisions Prg-1.8, 1.9	Complete recommended zoning changes that facilitate the full range of General Plan densities	2024-2026	Citywide	
26	Revisions to Parking Standards Prg-1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 4.2	Complete an evaluation of residential off-street parking standards to reduce parking as a housing development expense	2024-2025	Citywide, especially within one-half mile of transit stops and bus corridors	Updated parking standards
27	Monitoring of Approved Development Projects Prg-4.6	Contact developers of approved projects at least once every six months between entitlement and issuance of building permit to discuss project status/schedule and any potential constraints that can be addressed.	2024-2031	Citywide, especially on pipeline project sites	Completion of most units in existing pipeline development by 2031

ID	Program	Specific Commitment(s)	Timeline	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
HOUSING MOBILITY THROUGH EXPANDED CHOICES IN HOUSING TYPES AND LOCATIONS					
28	Extremely Low-Income (ELI) Housing Resources Pol-1.3, 1.12 Prg-4.6	Identify sites for additional ELI housing projects and begin exploration for funding sources for ELI housing units	Identify sites in 2025; begin exploration of funding sources in 2026	Citywide	Future new interim housing units for ELI households
29	Funding and Resources to Prevent and Reduce Homelessness Prg-4.3, 4.4, 4.5	Actively seek funding for strategies that prevent homelessness and help City residents experiencing homelessness in securing a place to live and access to services	2025-2026 onwards	Citywide	By 2031, seek at least \$500,000 dollars in funding.
30	Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) Prg-1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide expanded resources on ADUs on the City's website • Develop incentives such as fee waivers or tax abatements for owners who agree to rent their ADUs to qualifying lower income households • Pursue grant funding to help homeowners add ADUs with a deed restriction that limits occupancy to a lower income tenants 	2024-2025 onwards	Citywide, especially single-family neighborhoods	Create or legalize at least 10 ADUs a year through 2031, or 80 over the planning period.
31	Monitoring the Status of below-market-rate (BMR) Units Prg-3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enter agreement with County Housing Authority for monitoring of BMR ownership units • In 2024, identify a service provider to monitor BMR rental units • Meet with service providers at least every 6 months for updates on BMR portfolio 	2024-2025 onwards	Citywide	All tenants and homeowners qualify as lower or moderate-income households. All property owners charge appropriate rents for BMR units.

ID	Program	Specific Commitment(s)	Timeline	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
32	Housing Resources for Older Adults Prg-1.3, 3.3 Prg-4.2, 4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend affordable housing provisions to treat assisted living as a residential use rather than a commercial use so that the City's affordable housing requirements may be applied Work with the nonprofit sector to increase the number of permanently affordable senior housing units and affordable assisted living facilities 	2024-2025 onwards	Citywide	Increase housing units for older adults by 20 percent
33	Adaptable and Accessible Housing Pol-4.2 Pol-6.1 Prg-4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopt a Universal Design Ordinance that increases the number of units that are adaptable or accessible to persons with disabilities Amend the City's Affordable Housing Requirements to require affordable housing units to comply with universal design. Consider requiring that a percentage of units in new development be adaptable for persons with disabilities. Implement Reasonable Accommodation Achieve 100% compliance with all State laws regarding accessibility Eliminate any fee for a reasonable accommodation request 	2024-2025 onwards	Citywide	<p>Increase accessible units by 10 percent</p> <p>100% of new affordable housing units comply with universal design</p>
34	Residential Care Facilities Prg-1.3, Prg-4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add to the Municipal Code definitions of licensed and unlicensed group homes that conform to State standards Eliminate Code distinction between care facilities for persons with disabilities and other care facilities Adopt objective standards to allow for ministerial review in higher- density zoning districts 	2024-2025 onwards	Higher-density zoning districts	Reduction in time required for approval by 50% for residential care facilities

ID	Program	Specific Commitment(s)	Timeline	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
35	Affordable Housing for Large Families Pol-4.1 Prg-4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop thresholds for requiring three-bedroom affordable rental units in new construction for certain types of projects. When considering proposals for projects that are 100 percent affordable, express preference for a mix of housing units that include units designed for larger families. 	2024-2025 onwards	Citywide	Develop at least 50 three- bedroom apartments that are affordable to low- and very low- income households (i.e., 200 percent of the lower income RHNA units or 40 percent of lower-income pipeline units)
PLACE-BASED STRATEGIES FOR NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENTS					
36	Extremely Low-Income Housing Resources Pol-4.1 Prg-4.1	<p>Research best practices and develop a strategy to create interim housing with a strong service component to assist individuals in taking steps towards stable housing.</p> <p>Identify sites for interim housing pilot project, to be completed with State grants in partnership with community partners.</p> <p>Produce a stock of interim housing units with grants</p>	2024-2025 onwards	Areas with people experiencing homelessness, including but not limited to: Downtown, highway underpasses, and open space areas as applicable.	<p>In Year 1 of operating interim housing pilot (2025-26), house 50% of residents in permanent supportive housing.</p> <p>In Year 2 of operating interim housing pilot (2026-27), house at least additional 25% of residents in permanent supportive housing.</p>
37	Increasing Equity in Home Maintenance with Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program Prg-1.5 Pol-2.3, 2.4	Direct CDBG funds to provide property improvement loans and technical assistance to very low-income homeowners	Annually	Citywide	Assist up to a dozen households by 2031

ID	Program	Specific Commitment(s)	Timeline	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
38	Specific Plan to uplift east side neighborhoods Prg-1.5 Pol-2.3, 2.4	Prepare and adopt plan, regulatory framework, and environmental document	2027	Eastern neighborhoods of the City	Create housing capacity for at least 25 additional units
A	AFFH Action: Mental Health Liaison	<i>With very low occurrence on unhoused persons in the City, a full mental health position would not be necessary. Therefore, the City can rely on the mental health services and personnel of the County.</i>	2024-2025 onwards	Enclaves with high concentrations of people experiencing homelessness	<i>Connect people experiencing homelessness to mental health and housing services, including the Countywide amenities</i>
B	AFFH Action: SAFE Program	<i>In conjunction with the County Mental Health Department, launch a pilot program consisting of an Alternative Response Team, also known as the SAFE Team (Specialized Assistance For Everyone), a two-person mobile team comprised of a Crisis Intervention Specialist and an Emergency Medical Technician. They are tied into the emergency response system and will supplement Fire and Police response to calls for service.</i>	Launch three-year pilot in 2024-2025 onwards	Citywide	<i>Connect vulnerable community members, especially those with mental health history and those experiencing homelessness, to the best supportive services available</i>
C	AFFH Action: Small Business Assistance	<i>Work with the local Guadalupe Business Association to prevent displacement of small businesses in mixed use projects</i>	2025-2026 onwards	Citywide	<i>100% of small businesses impacted by mixed use projects are successfully incorporated or relocated</i>
D	AFFH Action: Neighborhood Lighting Improvements	<i>Improve lighting in the downtown based on community feedback (Public Works)</i>	2025-2026 onwards	Downtown neighborhood	<i>Assess and address better lighting conditions at existing poles that have no or weak lighting</i>

ID	Program	Specific Commitment(s)	Timeline	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
E	AFFH Action: Digital divide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citywide Public Wi-Fi Network; Work with County to address digital equity/divide • Grant funding for dedicated broadband infrastructure • City-wide language access; Hybrid communications engagement strategy 	2025-2026 onwards	Citywide	<p>Establish Wi-Fi access for residents; apply for grants from the PUC for a feasibility study for broadband infrastructure in the City; hire community engagement staff for Strategic Communications Plan</p>
F	AFFH Action: Park Master Plan Improvements	<p>Develop a City-wide Parks and Recreation Master Plan that incorporates environmental justice and social equity as key elements in the operation and planning of the City's park and recreation network</p>	2025-2026 onwards	Citywide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop guide to further develop parks and recreational programs for all ages, abilities, and activities. Create and maintain funding and set priorities for the future
G	AFFH Action: Flood Level Rise and Resilience Study	<p>Conduct feasibility study for nature-based, hybrid, and hard infrastructure protection of the City. Build capacity in community-based organizations. Engage and educate residents and youth in the study to learn about and give input on the study and choose options to pursue.</p>	2025-2026 onwards	Citywide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a community-based adaptation planning team with the City and County • Develop at least one option/project for further development and to seek funding for implementation

ID	Program	Specific Commitment(s)	Timeline	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Codify resident feedback and choices into the City's adaptation, neighborhood, and land use planning policies and documents</i>
H	<p><i>AFFH Action: Implementation of Multi-Modal Transportation Plan</i></p>	<p><i>Pedestrian and bicycle crossings of main thoroughfares; traffic calming and bicycle and pedestrian crossing improvements; transit bus stop improvements and maintenance; expanded transit service; transportation to schools</i></p>	2027	Citywide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Secure funding and complete feasibility studies</i> • <i>Implement quick-build crossing projects and traffic calming programs</i> • <i>Implement bus stop improvements</i> • <i>Streamline maintenance process</i> • <i>Conduct focused ridership survey on transit line</i> • <i>Secure funding and add additional runs</i>

A, B, . . . H = The City can implement these non-housing strategies to achieve more equitable and just outcomes. They can complement and advance AFFH principles to facilitate fair housing throughout the City.

7.0 Appendices

7.1 Appendix A: Evaluation of 2015 Housing Element

Government Code Section 65588(a) requires that jurisdictions evaluate the effectiveness of the existing Housing Element, the appropriateness of goals, objectives, and policies, and the progress in implementing programs for the previous planning period. This appendix contains a review of the goals, policies, and programs of the previous housing element and evaluates the degree to which these programs have been implemented during the previous planning period, 2019 through 2023. The analysis includes an assessment of the appropriateness of goals, objectives, policies, and programs.

7.1.1 Program Evaluation

Table A-1 summarizes the effectiveness of programs contained in the previous Housing Element along with responsible agencies, accomplishments, and policies or actions to pursue moving forward. All programs are essential for continued good planning and planning administration. The programs remain relevant and the recommendation is for all of them to continue in the new cycle.

7.1.2 Appropriateness of Goals and Policies

Table A-2 evaluates the appropriateness of previous goals and policies and identifies necessary changes considering the City's experience during the past planning period. The goals and policies address mandatory requirements for housing according to State law. Therefore, they remain appropriate and must be retained in the new cycle.

7.1.3. Progress in Meeting Quantified Objectives

Table A-3 presents the City's progress in meeting the quantified objectives across the two previous Housing Elements within the 5th Cycle . The DJ Farms Specific Plan area broke ground in 2015, built, and sold 130 new housing units by January 2019. By the end of 2022, the development completed 363 dwelling units out of a total authorization of 740 dwelling units (Guadalupe Building Department) leaving a difference of 377 units to construct during the new cycle. The units fall primarily in the moderate and above moderate-income categories, but nevertheless fulfilled more than the City's RHNA allocations for the planning period in those two income categories. The City fulfilled the housing need in the lower income categories with People's Self-Help construction of 37 assisted housing apartments and the construction of ADUs.

Table A-4 presents a summary of development activity in terms of permits from 2015 through 2021. Table A-4a provides a broad overview of trends and indicate that the period registered steady increases in permit activities for new homes and accessory dwelling units as well as extensions and repairs to existing housing.

Table A-4b shows details by income group of permit activity in the recent years for which data were available. The trends in development permit activity within Guadalupe reflected fluctuation from year to

year in number of entitlements approved, consistent number of building permits issued at about 70 per annum, and increasing number of certificates of occupancy issued as construction is completed for permits issued in prior years. It also shows that ADUs represented the latest form of satisfying demand for lower income housing. Most permitting activities, however, related to housing priced in the above moderate category.

Table A-5 presents analysis of completed housing construction since 2015. The analysis shows how much households could afford to pay for housing assuming 30 percent of income points that represent definitions of various income ranges. Estimate of mortgage payments under prevailing market conditions shed light on the household income groups that can afford the price ranges of the completed housing units.

7.1.4. Progress toward Special Needs Populations

Table A-3a reveals that Guadalupe produced 41 housing units in the three lower income categories compared to the 20 units allocated in the 5th Cycle. The foremost requirement for special needs housing is affordability. In producing the lower income units, the City largely fulfilled the single most important need and additionally, implementation addressed accessibility issues with disabled people and seniors. The City fulfilled the housing need in the lower income categories with People's Self-Help construction of 37 assisted housing apartments and the construction of ADUs.

7.1.5. Shortfall of Sites from the 5th Cycle Planning Period

There was no shortage of sites for housing in Guadalupe over the 5th Cycle planning period. The following paragraphs explain.

The 5th Cycle Housing Element relied on the production of housing within the then newly approved DJ Farms Specific Plan area for a compact City hemmed in by Williamson Act contract lands and the coastal zone. The Plan worked beyond expectations when DJ Farms broke ground in 2015 as the Pasadera Development, built and sold 130 new housing units by January 2019. This compared to the total RHNA allocation of 50. As of August 2022, which was toward the end of the 5th Cycle, 363 units were built with approval for construction of 377 more. The original Specific Plan was approved for 803 units.

Additionally, amendments to the Guadalupe Municipal Code in August 2017, January 2019, and December 2023, revised Chapter 18.53 of the Code on "ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS". The Municipal Code previously titled this chapter, "SECONDARY HOUSING UNITS." The revamped chapter is intended to comply with the latest requirements of State law (Government Code Section 65852.2), and to implement the policies in the City's 2042 General Plan and the Housing Element. The update allows accessory dwelling units (ADU) and Junior ADUs (JADU) through ministerial review in all Residential Districts. This created additional opportunities for housing units.

Table A-1: Evaluation of Programs in 2015 Housing Element - City of Guadalupe

[Table A-1] Program	Responsible Agency	Time Frame	Evaluation & 2015-2022 Accomplishments	Future Policies and Actions
<p>A.1. The City shall annually evaluate the adequacy of services and facilities for additional residential development. Service deficiencies and the cost of correcting such deficiencies will be identified and priorities will be set.</p>	<p>City Administrator</p>	<p>In effect during 5th cycle</p>	<p>Ongoing part of development review process. The City completed a water and wastewater system Master Plan and a water and wastewater rate study that incorporated the cost of needed water & wastewater capital Improvements, This program assured adequacy of services and facilities as actual housing construction became 4 times the RHNA allocation.</p>	<p>Continue program implementation</p>
<p>A.2. The City shall establish priority water and sewer service procedures for developments with units affordable to lower-income households.</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>In effect during 5th cycle</p>	<p>Part of development review process This enabled construction of ADU units and three dozen assisted housing apartments</p>	<p>Continue program implementation</p>
<p>A.3. The City should amend the zoning ordinance to comply with California State law and allow accessory dwelling units (ADU), mobile and manufactured homes, licensed residential care facilities and group homes with fewer than six residents, rental housing, and transitional and supportive housing in all residential zones. These uses are subject to those development and management standards</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>In effect since 2017</p>	<p>Amendments made to the Guadalupe Municipal Code between August 2017 and January 2019 include Chapter 18.53 of January 28, 2019 on "ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS". ADUs are easily permitted and a four ADU units were built.</p>	<p>Continue program to promote use of ADUs by providing a public awareness campaign to property owners, builders, and developers</p>

[Table A-1] Program	Responsible Agency	Time Frame	Evaluation & 2015-2022 Accomplishments	Future Policies and Actions
that apply to residential development within the same zone.				
A.4. The City shall require a 55-year continued affordability condition in projects that receive a density bonus that also utilize government funds. As an additional incentive, projects that do not use any government monies may be eligible for bonuses if the units have at least 20 years of continued affordability. The City will ensure all options comply with State density bonus laws.	Planning Department	In effect during 5th cycle	Ongoing part of development review process, Applied to the assisted living units.	Continue program implementation

[Table A-1] Program	Responsible Agency	Time Frame	Evaluation & 2015-2022 Accomplishments	Future Policies and Actions
<p>A.5. The City shall continue to work with the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority, People's Self-Help Housing Corporation, or other non-profit agencies to secure funds through State and Federal programs for development of new low-income housing, and rehabilitation or room additions to relieve overcrowding for existing low-income households. Opportunities for the development of housing at the ELI level shall be a priority, until the City meets its ELI housing allocation in the RHNA cycle. The City will coordinate with the County applications for new funding and will provide letters of support and technical support to nonprofits. The City will also participate in the Housing Trust Fund of Santa Barbara County to leverage the City's funding. The City will also continue to incentivize affordable housing by expediting the density bonus applications which include affordable housing. A report will be provided annually to the City Council on progress in this endeavor.</p>	<p>City Administrator</p>	<p>In effect during 5th cycle</p>	<p>Essential element of affordable housing facilitation and production. It aided the funding and construction of assisted housing apartments</p>	<p>Continue program implementation</p>

[Table A-1] Program	Responsible Agency	Time Frame	Evaluation & 2015-2022 Accomplishments	Future Policies and Actions
<p>A.6. The City of Guadalupe shall continue code enforcement efforts to preserve its existing housing stock and to expedite the issuance of building permits for new low-income housing, including those units at the ELI level, housing rehabilitation projects and room additions for existing low-income housing. All requests for funding assistance will be forwarded to the County of Santa Barbara Housing and Community Development Department's rehabilitation assistance program to help alleviate the impact of high overcrowding.</p>	<p>City Administrator</p>	<p>In effect during 5th cycle</p>	<p>Essential element of affordable housing retention. This has helped in maintaining the quality of affordable and assisted units in the City</p>	<p>Continue program implementation</p>
<p>B.1. The City shall coordinate its efforts with the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority to continue receiving Section 8 subsidy monies. A City staff liaison will have the responsibility of coordinating these efforts.</p>	<p>City Administrator</p>	<p>In effect during 5th cycle</p>	<p>Essential element of affordable housing for those in the very low end of income spectrum The subsidies have made housing affordable for large segments of the City's residents</p>	<p>Continue program implementation</p>
<p>C.1. Coordinate with the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority to maintain a list of all dwellings within the City that are subsidized by government funding or low-income housing developed through regulations or incentives.</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>In effect during 5th cycle</p>	<p>Essential element of tracking affordable housing. It has provided data for analysis in the development of the new housing element.</p>	<p>Continue program implementation</p>

[Table A-1] Program	Responsible Agency	Time Frame	Evaluation & 2015-2022 Accomplishments	Future Policies and Actions
The list shall include, at a minimum, the number of units, type of government program, and the date at which the units may convert to market-rate dwellings				
C.2. The City shall add to existing incentive programs, and include in all new incentive or regulatory programs, requirements, to give notice prior to conversion units to market rate.	Planning Department	In effect during 5th cycle	Ongoing part of development review process. This has aided the preservation of affordable units across the City.	Continue program implementation
D.1. The City shall amend its zoning ordinance to grant a density bonus in conformance with Chapter 16.97 of the State Density Bonus law, or exemption from the in-lieu fee requirement, or both for projects that include three- and four-bedroom units, or single room occupancy units, as a significant portion of the total project. The thresholds for determining the number of such units and exact size of the density increase or fee exemption shall be determined during drafting of the ordinance. The period of affordability for the density bonus units will be 55 years or more.	Planning Department	In effect during 5th cycle	Density bonus provision is part of zoning code. Besides DJ Farms no other major housing development projects occurred in the City. It helped in approval of the number of units at DJ Farms and enabled the development to provide multiple parks and infrastructure.	Continue program implementation

[Table A-1] Program	Responsible Agency	Time Frame	Evaluation & 2015-2022 Accomplishments	Future Policies and Actions
<p>D.2. The City shall adopt a procedure to make reasonable accommodations (i.e., modifications or exceptions) in its zoning laws and other land use regulations and practices when such accommodations may be necessary to afford persons with disabilities and other special needs an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling. The amendment to the Zoning Ordinance shall include a revised definition of family that is consistent with State housing law. It shall address all aspects of the Americans with Disabilities Act in regard to home construction, retrofitting restrictions, and parking requirements due to City Zoning Code. The City will also address financial incentives for developers who address code issues in new construction and in retrofitting existing homes.</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>In effect during 5th cycle</p>	<p>Compliance with ADA requirements is part of the Building Code. It has helped make lower income and assisted housing developments accessible to those with disabilities.</p>	<p>Continue program implementation</p>
<p>D.3. The City shall continue to provide information about housing opportunities and services for homeless persons to migrant farmworkers through the Police Department, as well as City Hall; provide</p>	<p>Police Department, City Administrator</p>	<p>Continued during 5th cycle</p>	<p>Information available at City Hall. This has aided a large segment of the population for whom English is a second language and incoming</p>	<p>Continue program implementation</p>

[Table A-1] Program	Responsible Agency	Time Frame	Evaluation & 2015-2022 Accomplishments	Future Policies and Actions
information in both English and Spanish and provide other additional language material to other minority languages in the community; and survey the community for the need of other language materials.			migrants to navigate the housing landscape.	
D.4. The City shall cooperate with Santa Barbara County and other agencies in the development of programs aimed at providing affordable multi-family housing, including housing for families with special needs. As part of this cooperation, the City shall identify one or more sites that could support affordable multi-family housing development and consult with the site owner and housing partners on the feasibility of developing the site for affordable housing.	Police Department, City Administrator	Continued during 5th cycle	This is necessary to continue provision of assisted housing for those in the lowest income brackets. This facilitated the construction of the new multi-family assisted living apartments of three dozen units.	Continue program implementation
D.5. To encourage transitional and supportive housing, the City will amend all zoning districts allowing residential uses to permit transitional and supportive housing as a residential use, subject only to those regulations that apply to other residential dwellings of the same type in the same zoning (i.e.,	Planning Department	Continued during 5th cycle	Overlay district created permitting such uses. This facilitate the construction of SROs, shelters, and ADUs in most zones within the City.	Continue program implementation

[Table A-1] Program	Responsible Agency	Time Frame	Evaluation & 2015-2022 Accomplishments	Future Policies and Actions
apartments in a multi-family zone).				
E.1. The City shall continue to implement Title 24 of the California Code on all new development.	Building Department	Continued during 5th cycle	Verified during plan check for building permits	Continue program implementation
E.2. The City shall work with PG&E to encourage existing residents to participate in energy efficiency retrofit programs. The City will consider sponsoring an energy awareness program, in conjunction with PG&E to educate residents about the benefits of various retrofit programs.	Planning Department	Implemented during 5th cycle	Disseminated collaboratively in utility bills	Continue program implementation
E.3. The City shall amend the subdivision ordinance to implement the subdivision map act on subdivision orientation for solar access.	Planning Department	In effect during 5th cycle	Part of development review process.	Continue program implementation
E.4. New annexations to the City shall be contiguous to the existing City to maintain compact urban form and energy efficiency.	Planning Department	Continued during 5th cycle	Addressed in update to General Plan	Continue program implementation

[Table A-1] Program	Responsible Agency	Time Frame	Evaluation & 2015-2022 Accomplishments	Future Policies and Actions
<p>E.5. The City shall apply for and support applications for affordable housing funds from agencies that reward and incentivize good planning. Examples include the HCD's Multi-family Housing Program (MHP) and California Tax Credit Allocation Committee resources which provide competitive advantage for affordable infill housing and affordable housing built close to jobs, transportation, and amenities.</p>	<p>City Administrator</p>	<p>Continued during 5th cycle</p>	<p>Part of application efforts for grant resources</p>	<p>Continue program implementation</p>
<p>E.6. Partner with public utility districts and private energy companies to promote free energy audits for low-income owners and renters, rebate programs for installing energy efficient features and appliances and public education about ideas to conserve energy.</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>Continued during 5th cycle</p>	<p>Disseminated collaboratively in utility bills</p>	<p>Continue program implementation</p>
<p>F.1. The City will continue to provide information from the Housing Authority and Department of Equal Housing and Employment regarding housing and tenant rights at City Hall. And the City will continue to provide information in Spanish as well as review the need for any third</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>Continued during 5th cycle</p>	<p>Information available at City Hall. This has aided a large segment of the population for whom English is a second language and incoming migrants to navigate rights and requirements for housing access in the City.</p>	<p>Continue program implementation</p>

[Table A-1] Program	Responsible Agency	Time Frame	Evaluation & 2015-2022 Accomplishments	Future Policies and Actions
language information in Guadalupe.				
F.2. The City will refer persons experiencing discrimination in housing to California Rural Legal Assistance. The City will cooperate with neighboring jurisdictions and local organizations that sponsor workshops on fair housing laws and how those who are victims of discrimination can address their grievances.	All city Departments that receive complaints	Continued during 5th cycle	Part of outreach activities. This has aided a large segment of the population and incoming migrants to fight off discrimination in housing access.	Continue program implementation
F.3. The City shall notify People's Self-Help Housing Corporation, Santa Barbara County Housing Authority, California Rural legal Assistance and local churches. as well as post notices at significant public locations, prior to any public hearing where the City is considering amending or updating the housing element.	Planning Department	Continued during 5th cycle	Part of outreach activities during development of plans. This has made People's Self-Help a strong partner for affordable and assisted housing production and collaboration with the City.	Continue program implementation

Table A-2: Appropriateness of 2015 Guadalupe Housing Element Goals and Policies

[Table A-2] Goals & Policy	Evaluation & 2015-2022 Accomplishments	Appropriateness
Goal A: An adequate supply of affordable housing for all income levels.	The City has exceeded it	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy A.1: The City shall provide an adequate number of housing sites for both rent and purchase to accommodate its share of regional housing needs, including the number of units for each income classification.	This City accomplished this with the new General Plan	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy A.2: The City shall ensure that adopted policies, regulations, and procedures do not add unnecessarily to the cost of housing while still attaining other important City objectives.	The City streamlined but largely left fees unchanged	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy A.3: The City shall give high priority for permit processing to low-income residential projects, and the highest priority for projects that provide housing units at the extremely-low income (ELI) level.	This integral to the development application review process	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy A.4: The City shall continue to support the efforts of the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority within the City.	The City and SBCHA are strong cooperating partners	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy A.5: The City shall, through the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority or in conjunction with nonprofit or for-profit developers, apply for funds from the State and Federal governments to construct housing for low-income households.	The City has strong partnership with SBCHA, People’s Self-Help and Habitat for Humanity	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy A. 6: The City shall continue to provide Section 8 assistance to eligible households through the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority.	This has greatly aided large segments of residents	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy A. 7: Housing for low-income households that is required in a new residential project shall not be concentrated into a single building or portion of the site but shall be dispersed throughout the project, to the extent practical given the size of the project and other site constraints.	This has fostered integration in the City	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy A. 8: low-income housing produced through government subsidies or through incentives or regulatory programs shall be distributed throughout the City and not concentrated in a particular area of the community.	This is the case in the City and prevented segregation	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy A. 9: The City shall require low-income housing units in density bonus projects to be available at the same time as the market-rate units in the project.	This is part of the application review process for development	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy A. 10: The City shall encourage the development of multi-family dwellings in locations where adequate facilities are available and where such development would be consistent with neighborhood character.	This has aided cost effective construction of affordable units	Still Appropriate - retain

[Table A-2] Goals & Policy	Evaluation & 2015-2022 Accomplishments	Appropriateness
Policy A. 11: The City shall allow rehabilitation for legal, non-conforming dwellings that do not meet current lot size requirements, setbacks, yard requirements, and other current zoning requirements, so long as the non-conformity is not increased and there is no threat to public health and or safety.	This is part of the application review process for development	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy A. 12: To meet the City's needs to provide housing at the extremely low income (ELI) level, the City shall encourage projects that meet the housing needs of ELI households by offering financial incentives, financial assistance, or regulatory concessions to encourage the development of ELI units, such as that provided by single-room occupancy units. The City shall consider prioritizing its affordable housing development assistance to one or more projects that meet the City's ELI housing needs, as identified in the latest RHNA allocation.	This culminated in the construction of three dozen apartments as solely assisted living units	Still Appropriate - retain
Goal B: Conservation and rehabilitation of the City's existing stock of affordable housing.	This has preserved the affordable housing stock	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy B.1: The City shall refer all requests for the funding of rehabilitation projects or the construction of new affordable housing projects to the Santa Barbara County Housing and Community Development Department.	This aided construction of three dozen apartments as solely assisted living units	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy B.2: The City shall continue to coordinate with the Santa Barbara County Housing Authority to maintain Section 8 rent subsidies.	This aids large segments of residents in the City	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy B.3: The City shall apply for funds, including CDBG grants for the purpose of rehabilitating low cost, owner occupied and rental housing.	This contributed to upkeep of affordable units across the City	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy B.4: Private financing of the rehabilitation of housing shall be encouraged.	Is has given flexibility to providers of affordable housing	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy B.5: The City shall require the abatement of unsafe structures, while giving property owners ample time to correct deficiencies. Residents displaced by such abatement should be provided relocation assistance.	Given ample time has been the practice and has worked well	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy B.6: The demolition of existing multi-family housing shall be allowed when: a) the structure(s) is found to be substandard and unsuitable for rehabilitation; b) tenants are provided reasonable notice and an opportunity to purchase the property; and c) relocation assistance is provided.	There has not been the need to demolish multi-family housing but the policy is good.	Still Appropriate - retain
Goal C: Preservation of all at-risk units in Guadalupe.	This has helped avoid displacements	Still Appropriate - retain

[Table A-2] Goals & Policy	Evaluation & 2015-2022 Accomplishments	Appropriateness
Policy C.1: The City shall strive to preserve all at-risk dwelling units	This has helped avoid displacements	Still Appropriate - retain
<p>Policy C.2: At least two years notice shall be required prior to the conversion of any units for low-income households to market rate units in any of the following circumstances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The units were constructed with the aid of government funding • The units were required by an inclusionary zoning ordinance • The project was granted a density bonus • The project received other incentives <p>Such a notice shall be given at least to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City; • HCD; • Santa Barbara County Housing Authority; and • Residents of at-risk units. 	There has not been recent need to convert units for low-income households	Still Appropriate - retain
Goal D: Adequate housing for special needs groups in Guadalupe, including farmworkers, people with disabilities, and large families.	This is the City's strength historically and enabled new RHNA allocations in the moderate and above moderate-income groups.	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy D.1: The City shall encourage the development of housing for farmworkers and large families.	This is the City's strength historically and enable it to house farmworkers who are vital for its economic base	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy D.2: The City will encourage the removal of housing restraints for those with disabilities as outlined in Senate Bill 520 (Chapter 671 California Code).	This has made the City a friendly place for persons with disabilities	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy D.3: The City shall provide information to migrant farmworkers about housing opportunities and services for in the area.	This has aided a large segment of incoming migrants to access housing conveniently	Still Appropriate - retain
Goal E: Energy efficient housing units that result in a reduction in energy costs to Guadalupe residents.	This is implemented during the application review process	Still Appropriate - retain

[Table A-2] Goals & Policy	Evaluation & 2015-2022 Accomplishments	Appropriateness
Policy E.1: All new dwelling units shall be required to meet current State requirements for energy efficiency and retrofiting of existing units shall be encouraged.	This is implemented during the application review process	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy E.2: New land use patterns shall encourage energy efficiency, to the extent possible.	The spirit of the new General Plan encapsulates this policy	Still Appropriate - retain
Goal F: Assurance of equal access to sound, affordable housing for all persons regardless of race, creed, age or sex.	The City has lived by this tenet making it one of the most diverse communities in the area.	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy F.1: The City declares that all persons regardless of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, or disability should have equal access to sound and affordable housing.	The City has lived by this tenet making it one of the most diverse communities in the area.	Still Appropriate - retain
Policy F.2: The City will promote the enforcement of the policies of the State Fair Employment and Housing Commission.	The City has lived by this tenet making it one of the most diverse communities in the area.	Still Appropriate - retain

Table A-3a. Progress in Achieving Quantified Objectives (All Incomes)

Income Category	Quantified Objective	Completed Progress				Future
	(Allocated 5th Cycle Dwelling Units)	(Completed 2015 to 2019)	(Completed 2019 to 2022)	Total Completed in 5th Cycle	Percent of 5th Cycle RHNA Completed	(Dwelling Units Pending Construction)
	RHNA Allocation	New Construction				
Extremely low	5	2	4	6	120%	0
Very Low	7	1	26	27	386%	0
Low	8	1	7	8	100%	0
Moderate	13	23	131	154	1185%	40
Above Moderate	17	107	102	209	1229%	284
Total	50	134	270	404	808%	320

00 – Accessory Dwelling Units

00 – People’s Self-Help Housing Project

00 – Pasadera Housing Development

DJ Farms Specific Plan broke ground in 2015, built and sold 130 new housing units by January 2019.

DJ Farms built 363 dwelling units by end of 2022 (Guadalupe Building Department).

DJ Farms had authorization to construct a total of 740 dwelling units as of the end of 2022.

DJ Farms had a difference of 377 units to construct as of the end of 2022

Sources: City of Guadalupe Planning Department; SBCAG, 2014-2022 RHNA Allocations.

Table A-3b. Progress in Achieving Quantified Objectives (Lower Incomes) – Completed Apartments

Tenant Affordability Level	Number of Units	Mechanism to Achieve Affordability
At or below 30% AMI – Extremely Low	4	Rent set to tenant income
At or below 40% AMI – Very Low	2	Rent set to tenant income
At or below 45% AMI – Very Low	5	Rent set to tenant income
At or below 50% AMI – Very Low	19	Rent set to tenant income
At or below 60% AMI – Low	7	Rent set to tenant income
Total (dwelling units in Guadalupe Courts)	37	Prg-1.4 & Prg-1.5 (Chapter 6)

Table A-3c. Progress in Achieving Quantified Objectives (Lower Incomes) – Completed ADUs

ADU	Location	Square Feet	Cost Estimate	Interest Rate	Term (Years)	Monthly Payment	Monthly+25% Maintenance	Income Groups	Total Payment
1	4443 Elm St	396	\$34,000	5%	30	(\$182)	\$227	EL	\$65,434
2	4578 Twelfth St.	800	\$50,000	5%	30	(\$267)	\$334	EL	\$96,227
3	379 Campodonico	1,023	\$90,000	5%	30	(\$481)	\$601	VL	\$173,209
4	150 Egret Lane	976	\$200,000	5%	30	(\$1,069)	\$1,336	L	\$384,908

Table A-4a: Residential Permit Activities - City of Guadalupe, 2015 through 2021

A-4a: Residential Permits	2015 Permits Issued	2016 Permits Issued	2017 Permits Issued	2019 Permits Issued	2020 Permits Issued	2021 Permits Issued
Detached Single-family Dwellings	6	35	95		85	148
Detached Single-family Dwellings w/ Secondary Dwelling						
Attached Single-family Dwellings						
Attached Single-family Dwelling w/ Secondary Dwelling						
Attached or Detached Secondary Dwellings		1			6	14
Multi-family Dwellings				72		
Residential Additions	5	5	2			
Residential Alterations	3	5	8			
New Garage/Carports		3	1			
Residential Repairs						
Residential Re-roofs	27	18	35			
Residential Misc. Plumbing, Electrical, Mechanical Permit	39	57	39			
Residential Accessory Buildings, Structures, Driveways	3	4	6			
Residential Pools/ Spas						
Residential Grading, Site Work, Stockpiling, Misc.						
Residential Demolitions						
Residential Permit Re-issued		1	1			
Residential Solar	43	41	9			
Residential Fire	8	34	86			
Total Residential Permits	134	204	282	72	91	162

Source: Guadalupe Planning Department

Table A-4b: Recent Residential Permit Activities by Income - City of Guadalupe, 2019-2021

Income Group	2019				2020				2021			
	Multifamily (5+ units)	Accessory Dwelling Units	Single Family Detached	Grand Total	Multifamily (5+ units)	Accessory Dwelling Units	Single Family Detached	Grand Total	Multifamily (5+ units)	Accessory Dwelling Units	Single Family Detached	Grand Total
Entitlements												
Very Low- Income Deed Restricted				0				0				0
Very Low- Income Non Deed Restricted				0				0				0
Low- Income Deed Restricted				0				0				0
Low- Income Non Deed Restricted				0				0				0
Moderate- Income Deed Restricted				0				0				0
Moderate- Income Non Deed Restricted				0				0				0
Above/Moderate-Income				0				0			57	57
Subtotal Entitlements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	57
Building Permits												
Very Low- Income Deed Restricted	30			30				0				0
Very Low- Income Non Deed Restricted				0				0				0
Low- Income Deed Restricted	7			7				0				0
Low- Income Non Deed Restricted				0		6		6				0
Moderate- Income Deed Restricted	1			1				0				0
Moderate- Income Non Deed Restricted	34			34				0				0
Above/Moderate-Income				0				67	12	57		69
Subtotal Permits	72	0	0	72	0	6	67	73	0	12	57	69
Certificates of Occupancy												
Very Low- Income Deed Restricted				0				0				0
Very Low- Income Non Deed Restricted				0				0				0
Low- Income Deed Restricted				0				0				0
Low- Income Non Deed Restricted				0				0				0
Moderate- Income Deed Restricted				0				0				0
Moderate- Income Non Deed Restricted				0				4				4
Above/Moderate-Income				0				14	2	34		36
Subtotal Certificates	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	18	0	2	34	36
Grand Total All Activities	72	0	0	72	0	6	85	91	0	14	148	162

Source: Guadalupe Planning Department

Table A-4c: Recent Activities on ADUs - City of Guadalupe, Nov. 2019 to Nov. 2023

Activity Type	4-Year Total	Average Annual
Completed construction	53	13.25
Approved but construction not completed	21	5.25
Planning - application in planning process	6	1.50
Total Activities	80	20.00

Source: Guadalupe Planning Department

Table A-5: Affordability of Residential Construction - City of Guadalupe, Late 2015 to Early 2019

Income Range for Santa Barbara County Area Median Income			
Income Group	Low	Mid	High
Extremely Low	\$12,000	\$16,203	\$20,407
Very Low	\$20,408	\$27,210	\$34,012
Low	\$34,012	\$44,215	\$54,418
Moderate	\$54,419	\$68,023	\$81,628
Above Moderate	\$81,628	\$100,814	\$120,000
Affordable Monthly Housing Expenditure @ 30% of Monthly Income			
Extremely Low	\$300	\$405	\$510
Very Low	\$510	\$680	\$850
Low	\$850	\$1,105	\$1,360
Moderate	\$1,360	\$1,701	\$2,041
Above Moderate	\$2,041	\$2,520	\$3,000
DJ Farms Home Price	\$340,000	\$400,000	\$470,000
Potential Mortgage (P&I)	\$1,786	\$2,101	\$2,469

DJ Farms Housing Production	Cielo Collection	Paseo Collection	ALL
Planned units	217	600	817
Price Range	\$340k to \$400k	\$400k to \$470k	\$340k to \$470k
Assumed Home Price	\$340,000	\$400,000	\$470,000
Potential Mortgage (P&I)	\$1,786	\$2,101	\$2,469
Construction Start	Late 2015	Late 2015	Late 2015
Built by January 2019	23	107	130
Percent of Total Built	18%	82%	100%

ESTIMATED MONTHLY PAYMENT

Your payment: **\$2,101** /mo

[Get pre-qualified](#)

Estimated taxes & insurance of \$395 are not included.

Home price: \$ 400,000 | Down payment: \$ 20,000 | 5 %

Loan term: 30-year fixe | Interest rate: 4.209 % Today's rate

Sample calculation of mortgage terms and payment

Figure A-2: Peoples' Self-Help Housing Breaks Ground on New Affordable Housing in Guadalupe, CA

The screenshot shows the website for Peoples' Self-Help Housing. At the top left is the organization's logo, which consists of a stylized red house shape with two human figures inside, followed by the text "Peoples' Self-Help Housing". To the right of the logo are two buttons: a black "Volunteer" button and a red "Donate Now" button. Below these is a red navigation bar with white text for "HOME ABOUT HOUSING PROGRAMS JOBS EVENTS GIVING VOLUNTEER MEDIA CONTACT". On the left side, there is a dark grey sidebar with a "MEDIA" section containing a list of links: "Press Releases", "In the News", "Event Photos", "Annual Reports", "E-Newsletters", "Blog", and "Video Library". The "Press Releases" link is highlighted in blue. The main content area features a "Press Releases" section with the title "Peoples' Self-Help Housing Breaks Ground on New Affordable Housing in Guadalupe, CA" and a sub-headline "Posted on 01/04/2019". Below the text is an architectural rendering of a large, multi-story apartment building with a modern design, featuring a central entrance and multiple balconies. To the right of the main content is a blue sidebar with a list of links: "Press Releases", "In the News", "Event Photos", "Annual Reports", "E-Newsletters", "Blog", and "Video Library". The "Press Releases" link is highlighted in white.

Source: https://pshhc.org/medias/press_releases.html/article/2019/01/04/peoples-self-help-housing-breaks-ground-on-new-affordable-housing-in-guadalupe-ca

7.2 Appendix B: Residential Land Inventory

7.2.0 Site Analysis for 6th Cycle RHNA

7.2.0.1 Pipeline Projects for 6th Cycle RHNA & Buffer

Preparation of the 2042 Guadalupe General Plan included a complete land use inventory in 2017, which identified specific sites that are suitable for residential development. For the 2023 to 2031 planning horizon, the Santa Barbara County Council of Governments approved the Regional Housing Needs Allocations (RHNA) and assigned a total of 431 new housing units to Guadalupe. This analysis compares the City’s regional housing need allocation of 431 units with its pipeline projects that are either under construction or are on the cusps of starting construction. To accommodate the RHNA, the examination focused initially on the development potential of vacant lots that are infill sites and such approved housing projects as multi-family development of People’s Self-Help and expansion of the Pasadera development in the DJ Farms Specific Plan area as well as pipeline projects that received a certificate of occupancy after the beginning of the SBCAG projection period. Table B-1 shows the distribution of the City’s allocation by income groups side-by-side with the numbers of pipeline units slated for delivery during the 6th Cycle. It became immediately clear that housing units under pipeline projects were sufficient to accommodate the City’s allocation by income categories.

Table B-1: Summary of 2023-2031 RHNA Allocations to Guadalupe vs. Pipeline Projects

Income Group	Dwelling Units ¹	Percent of RHNA	Pipeline Projects ²	Vacant DJ Farms Parcels ³	Subtotal Pipeline Units	Percent Above RHNA (Buffer)
Extremely Low	1	0.20%	38	0	38	3700%
Very Low	2	0.50%	40	0	40	1900%
Low	24	5.60%	40	0	40	67%
Moderate	77	17.90%	22	74	96	22%
Above Moderate	327	75.90%	0	391	391	20%
Total	431	100.00%	140	465	605	40%

¹Source: SBCAG, 2023-2031 Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan

²Pipeline projects under construction in the City by PSHH, Escalante Meadows, and private development; all to be inhabited within 6th Cycle

³Two relatively large parcels designated and zoned for housing but are vacant with potential to meet the large RHNA for “above moderate” that are allocated to the City.


Figure B-1 shows the locations of pipeline projects and additional opportunities to consolidate vacant lots at two locations to become suitable for the development of additional low-income housing. Given that housing distribution across the City historically depicts a mixture of income types, the locations of pipeline and potential consolidation sites reinforce such a desirable distribution of housing by income. The following are noteworthy:

- There are two pipeline projects which are near completion for the three lowest income categories, which include 38 extremely low-income by People’s Self Help Housing (PSHH) as well

as 80 units in the very low and low-income Escalante Meadows development as Table B-1 shows. Projects with low and very low-income rentals are guaranteed for the life of the projects due to agreements made at the time that federal loans were issued for the construction of these projects. As Figure B-1 indicates, PSHH units are anticipated to be fully occupied within 2024 while the units in Escalante Meadows are expected to be fully occupied within 2025.

- In addition, a private developer has almost completed constructing a third pipeline project of 22 units in the moderate-income category as Table B-1 shows. Figure B-1 shows that these moderate-income units are next door to the PSHH project for those in the extremely low-income category. The moderate units are expected to be occupied in early 2025.

Figure B-1: Locations of Pipeline Projects and Potential Lot Consolidations in 6th Cycle



- The impending phase of the Pasadera development on two relatively large vacant parcels in the DJ Farms specific plan area totaling approximately 44 acres (not identified in previous cycles) that the General Plan and zoning designate for housing development, can accommodate a total of 465 units to serve the moderate and above moderate-income groups as Table B-1 shows.

- Overall, these pipeline projects can accommodate the full RHNA for the 6th Cycle plus an overall buffer of 40 percent more units. It is noteworthy that there is no buffer in any income category that is below 20 percent. The buffers of units slated for delivery are higher than the 15%+ buffer that SB 166 (2021) requires. The next subsection identifies surpluses of additional sites.
- Furthermore, during preparation of this Housing Element, other projects have come online. In addition to the large, low-income housing projects (identified in previous paragraphs) that will be occupied later this year or next year, a number of smaller housing projects have been approved in the past year and are now in “the pipeline” since they have been issued building permits. Two of the new projects are projected to have apartment units that will be rented in the moderate-income range. The Crandall Apartments are providing nine new units and two ADUs while the Edwards Apartments are providing eight new units – all in the moderate-income range. The planning office anticipates the same developers will submit additional projects with similar housing products to provide rental units in the moderate-income range.

Implications for Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH): The locations and distribution of the key pipeline projects contributing to the 6th Cycle RHNA have implications for Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH). There is a potential to look at the sites and wonder initially if there is integration by income since lower income housing units seem concentrated in the north while moderate income housing seems concentrated in the DJ Farms area to the south. The answer is affirmative in terms of AFFH integration. The central city already has mixed income housing which combines lower-income and moderate-income units. Additionally, the following is notable:

- Pipeline projects counting toward 6th Cycle RHNA include moderate income apartments on East 11th St, which are currently almost completed. These moderate units are right next door to the extremely low-income housing in the PSHH project and rather close to the low and very low-income housing in Escalante Meadows.
- Together with the units at DJ Farms to the south the moderate units that are existing or under construction occur from north to south across the City, interspersed with the lower income units also spread across the City.
- Furthermore, recent ADU construction is also spread through the central city and are largely moderate units intermixed with housing for the range of income levels.
- Finally, Program 6.8 is added to promote upper income housing as well in the downtown area.

Progress in Meeting 6th Cycle RHNA: Projects counting toward the 6th Cycle RHNA are already being implemented as evidenced by the issuance of building permits, the commencement of construction activities, and near-completion of three out of four pipeline projects. For Pasadera, previous hold-ups with the local rail line over crossing permits have recently been resolved (in mid-2024), paving the way for construction to resume. The development already has recorded lots therefore the next action is the issuance of building permits for the new homes. Given the developer’s record of accomplishment, construction is anticipated to be complete within the 6th Cycle.

7.2.0.2 Additional Site Analysis Above 6th Cycle RHNA

Tables in this section of the report identify **additional** residential development capacity over and above what is required for the 6th Cycle RHNA. The site inventory and analysis are to help in determining whether program actions are necessary to designate sites with appropriate zoning, development standards, and infrastructure capacity to accommodate the RHNA-allocated units. Using the inventory of available land, the analysis proceeded to determine (a) the suitability of individual parcels and (b) the appropriate development densities. To accommodate future housing potential, the examination focused on the development potential of vacant land that are infill sites for location efficiency and maximum accessibility. The following paragraph describes the methodology applied to determine residential development capacity.

Residential development potential depends initially on the residential density standards of the City. The analysis evaluated whether site constraints and land use controls enabled the achievement of the permitted densities. First, the acreage of the parcel was multiplied by the allowable density. Fractional components on the number of units allowed under the density standards were discarded. The allowable unit calculation applied base land use densities with no assumptions about density bonuses. A parcel-by-parcel evaluation of any unusual site characteristics or land use controls revealed where the allowable number of residential units should adjust further downward in areas where additional constraints to development existed. Constraints that resulted in lower residential capacity included road rights-of-way, irregular lot shapes, difficulty in meeting minimum roadway frontage requirements, and existence of wetlands or drainage courses on the parcels. The methodology results in a more conservative residential capacity that takes into consideration special or unusual circumstances.

7.2.1 Vacant Land

In 2017, the City and Regional Planning Department of the California Polytechnic State University conducted a parcel-by-parcel inventory of all land within the City. The inventory revealed that 4.9 acres of vacant land that is zoned for housing is available and suitable to accommodate 57 housing units. Table B-2 summarizes the inventory of vacant residential infill sites within the built-up area and indicates there is opportunity for housing to suit all income segments within the community. Most of these sites, which is 40 out of 57, can accommodate low, very low, and extremely low-income housing. It is noteworthy that housing development in the DJ Farms Specific Plan Area into the Pasadera Housing neighborhood during the 5th Cycle dominated housing over-production in the City of Guadalupe so that most of the previous vacant sites scattered within the community remain to accommodate housing need within the 6th Cycle and beyond. **All parcels in Table B-2 also appeared in the 5th Cycle. Most of the parcels in Table B-2 are scattered throughout the City with built-up lots separating them. There are two locations where the vacant, small lots may be consolidated to meet the 0.5-acre lot size requirements for low-income housing development as follows:**

- One location is north of Hwy 166 and west of Hwy 1 (115-201-011, 115-201-012, 115-201-013) into a consolidated size of (0.18 + 0.17 + 0.18) or 0.53 acres.
- The second location is between Olivera St and Pacheco St, south of Hwy 1 (115-102-015, 115-102-016, 115-102-017, 15-102-018) into a consolidated size of (0.17 + 0.17 + 0.17 + 0.17) or 0.68 acres.

Table B-2: Inventory of Vacant Residential Infill Sites in Guadalupe from Land Use Inventory

[Table B-2] Parcel Number	Parcel Size	General Plan Designation	Zoning Designation	Density (du per acre)	Capacity (dwelling units)	Income Group Affordability	On-Site Constraints
113-370-037	0.27	Low Density	R-1	6.00	1	Above Moderate, Moderate	Road Access Required
115-122-001	0.2	Low Density	R-1	6.00	1	Above Moderate, Moderate	None
115-132-016	0.22	Low Density	R-1	6.00	1	Above Moderate, Moderate	None
115-201-011	0.18	Low Density	R-1	6.00	1	Above Moderate, Moderate	None
115-201-012	0.17	Low Density	R-1	6.00	1	Above Moderate, Moderate	None
115-201-013	0.18	Low Density	R-1	6.00	1	Above Moderate, Moderate	None
115-230-010	0.25	Low Density	R-1	6.00	1	Above Moderate, Moderate	None
115-082-021	1.03	Medium Density	R-2	10.00	10	Moderate, Low	None
115-032-005	0.11	High Density	R-3	20.00	1	Low, Very Low, Extremely low	Irregularly shaped lot
115-034-016	0.33	High Density	R-3	20.00	6	Low, Very Low, Extremely low	None
115-035-001	0.35	High Density	R-3	20.00	7	Low, Very Low, Extremely low	None
115-035-006	0.17	High Density	R-3	20.00	3	Low, Very Low, Extremely low	None
115-036-002	0.12	High Density	R-3	20.00	2	Low, Very Low, Extremely low	None
115-036-015	0.12	High Density	R-3	20.00	2	Low, Very Low, Extremely low	None

[Table B-2] Parcel Number	Parcel Size	General Plan Designation	Zoning Designation	Density (du per acre)	Capacity (dwelling units)	Income Group Affordability	On-Site Constraints
115-036-018	0.17	High Density	R-3	20.00	3	Low, Very Low, Extremely low	None
115-102-013	0.17	High Density	R-3	20.00	3	Low, Very Low, Extremely low	None
115-102-015	0.17	High Density	R-3	20.00	3	Low, Very Low, Extremely low	Drainage Crosses far southeastern corner of site
115-102-016	0.17	High Density	R-3	20.00	1	Low, Very Low, Extremely low	Drainage crosses site
115-102-017	0.17	High Density	R-3	20.00	3	Low, Very Low, Extremely low	Drainage crosses southeastern corner of site
15-102-018	0.17	High Density	R-3	20.00	3	Low, Very Low, Extremely low	Drainage crosses northwestern corner of site
115-063-019	0.18	High Density	R-3	20.00	3	Low, Very Low, Extremely low	None

The Guadalupe 2042 General Plan identified several other opportunities for housing development in the City. These include many small, vacant lots which might need some mitigation or might allow accessory dwelling units, mixed-use sites, and a large reservoir of development opportunity in the DJ Farms Specific Plan area. Figure B-2 shows the distribution of opportunity sites across the City. The next two subsections present opportunities for housing at mixed-use locations and the DJ Farms site. Table B-3 is an inventory of “other vacant lands” within the built-up area. **Except for the first four parcels, all other parcels in Table B-3 also appeared in the 5th Cycle.**

Figure B-2: Opportunities for Housing at Vacant Infill, Mix-Use, and DJ Farms Sites




Table B-3: Other Vacant Residential Land within Built-Up Area

[Table B-3] Parcel Number	Zoning Designation	Parcel Size (Acreage)	Income Group Affordability	Parcel Listed in Previous Cycle?
113-320-097	R-2	0.31	Moderate	No
113-370-036	R-2	0.1	Moderate	No
113-370-037	R-2	0.27	Moderate	No
113-370-038	R-2	0.25	Moderate	No
113-450-004	R-2	31.25	Moderate	No
113-460-001	R-2	0.15	Moderate	Yes
113-460-002	R-2	0.13	Moderate	Yes
113-460-003	R-2	0.13	Moderate	Yes
113-460-004	R-2	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-460-005	R-2	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-460-006	R-2	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-460-007	R-2	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-460-008	R-2	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-460-009	R-2	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-460-010	R-2	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-460-011	R-2	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-460-012	R-2	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-460-013	R-2	0.17	Moderate	Yes
113-460-014	R-2	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-460-015	R-2	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-460-017	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-460-032	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-460-033	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-460-034	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-460-035	R-1	0.11	Moderate	Yes
113-460-036	R-1	0.17	Moderate	Yes
113-470-001	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-470-002	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-470-003	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-470-004	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-470-005	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-470-006	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-470-007	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-470-008	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-470-009	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-470-010	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-470-011	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-470-012	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-480-001	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes

[Table B-3] Parcel Number	Zoning Designation	Parcel Size (Acreage)	Income Group Affordability	Parcel Listed in Previous Cycle?
113-480-002	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-480-003	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-480-004	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-480-005	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-480-006	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-480-007	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-480-008	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-480-009	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-480-010	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-480-011	R-1	0.11	Moderate	Yes
113-480-012	R-1	0.14	Moderate	Yes
113-480-013	R-1	0.2	Moderate	Yes
113-480-014	R-1	0.18	Moderate	Yes
113-480-015	R-1	0.17	Moderate	Yes
113-480-016	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-480-017	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-480-018	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-480-019	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
113-480-020	R-1	0.12	Moderate	Yes
115-031-001	R-1	0.01	Moderate	Yes
115-036-012	R-1	0.19	Moderate	Yes
115-041-010	R-1	0.11	Moderate	Yes
115-063-002	R-1	0.1	Moderate	Yes
115-063-011	R-1	0.09	Moderate	Yes
115-082-009	R-1	0.09	Moderate	Yes
115-102-014	R-1	0.17	Moderate	Yes
115-102-022	R-1	0.36	Moderate	Yes
115-153-014	Undecided	0.18	Moderate/Lower	Yes
115-201-012	Undecided	0.17	Moderate/Lower	Yes
115-201-013	Undecided	0.18	Moderate/Lower	Yes
115-202-002	Undecided	0.18	Moderate/Lower	Yes
115-230-009	Undecided	0.48	Moderate/Lower	Yes
115-230-028	Undecided	1.77	Moderate/Lower	Yes
115-230-030	Undecided	2.92	Moderate/Lower	Yes
Total	All	45.88		

7.2.2 Mixed-Use Development

The updated General Plan designates mixed-use development strategically in the City’s Central Business District. This offers additional housing opportunities, including those for lower income residents. The

General Plan identified 26.22 acres of commercially-zoned land across 113 parcels to accommodate mixed-use development. The General Plan specifies maximum building intensity standards of 0.35 floor-to-area ratio (FAR) under the general vision that upper levels would be developed for residential uses and lower levels for commercial uses. Table B-4 shows that at full build-out, mixed-use areas can accommodate 383 dwelling units. Conservatively assuming 20 percent buildout potential of sites zoned for general commercial use, the acreage could yield 54,874 square feet of residential development or 35 dwelling units (at approximately 1570 square feet of average unit size). Table B-5 lists additional mixed-use opportunities beyond the vetted sites. These other sites total approximately 10 additional acres of which 6.4 acres are under temporary agricultural use and are not likely to be developed for housing. **All parcels in Table B-4 also appeared in the 5th Cycle.**

Table B-4. Mixed-Use Development Potential

[Table B-4] Parcel Number	Parcel Site (sq. ft.)	Zoning	Floor-Area Ratio	Maximum Developable Area (sq. ft.)	Maximum Residential Area (sq. ft.)	Adjusted Potential Dwelling Units	On-Site Constraints	Income Group Affordability
115-092-001	23,958	MIX	0.35	8,385.30	5,618.15	9	None	Moderate
115-092-003	14,810	MIX	0.35	5,183.64	3,473.04	5	None	Moderate
115-092-004	10,019	MIX	0.35	3,506.58	2,349.41	3	None	Moderate
115-052-007	15,246	MIX	0.35	5,336.10	3,575.19	6	None	Moderate
115-051-007	19,166	MIX	0.35	6,708.24	4,494.52	7	None	Moderate
115-101-001	6,970	MIX	0.35	2,439.36	1,634.37	2	None	Moderate
115-052-015	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-140-011	22,651	MIX	0.35	7,927.92	5,311.71	8	None	Moderate
115-071-019	13,068	MIX	0.35	4,573.80	3,064.45	5	None	Moderate
115-052-018	10,019	MIX	0.35	3,506.58	2,349.41	3	None	Moderate
115-091-002	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-091-006	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-092-005	10,019	MIX	0.35	3,506.58	2,349.41	3	None	Moderate
115-113-001	12,197	MIX	0.35	4,268.88	2,860.15	4	None	Moderate
115-113-0Q4	7,841	MIX	0.35	2,744.28	1,838.67	3	None	Moderate
115-113-005	16,117	MIX	0.35	5,641.02	3,779.48	6	None	Moderate
115-071-015	11,761	MIX	0.35	4,116.42	2,758.00	4	None	Moderate
115-071-018	33,977	MIX	0.35	11,891.88	7,967.56	13	None	Moderate
115-072-014	2,178	MIX	0.35	762.30	510.74	0	None	Moderate
115-072-015	5,227	MIX	0.35	1,829.52	1,225.78	2	None	Moderate
115-072-018	11,326	MIX	0.35	3,963.96	2,655.85	4	None	Moderate
115-092-016	3,485	MIX	0.35	1,219.68	817.19	1	None	Moderate
115-092-017	2,178	MIX	0.35	762.30	510.74	0	None	Moderate
115-092-019	6,970	MIX	0.35	2,439.36	1,634.37	2	None	Moderate
115-092-023	3,485	MIX	0.35	1,219.68	817.19	1	None	Moderate
115-101-003	3,485	MIX	0.35	1,219.68	817.19	1	None	Moderate

[Table B-4] Parcel Number	Parcel Site (sq. ft.)	Zoning	Floor-Area Ratio	Maximum Developable Area (sq. ft.)	Maximum Residential Area (sq. ft.)	Adjusted Potential Dwelling Units	On-Site Constraints	Income Group Affordability
115-101-011	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-112-002	8,276	MIX	0.35	2,896.74	1,940.82	3	None	Moderate
115-121-014	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-072-001	10,890	MIX	0.35	3,811.50	2,553.71	4	None	Moderate
115-101-006	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-112-001	56,628	MIX	0.35	19,819.80	13,279.27	22	None	Moderate
115-113-006	16,117	MIX	0.35	5,641.02	3,779.48	6	None	Moderate
115-101-016	20,473	MIX	0.35	7,165.62	4,800.97	8	None	Moderate
115-052-009	5,663	MIX	0.35	1,981.98	1,327.93	2	None	Moderate
115-072-002	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-052-013	4,356	MIX	0.35	1,524.60	1,021.48	1	None	Moderate
115-092-009	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-092-021	10,890	MIX	0.35	3,811.50	2,553.71	4	None	Moderate
115-101-005	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-052-010	8,712	MIX	0.35	3,049.20	2,042.96	3	None	Moderate
115-051-004	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-072-010	5,227	MIX	0.35	1,829.52	1,225.78	2	None	Moderate
115-091-012	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-071-012	16,553	MIX	0.35	5,793.48	3,881.63	6	None	Moderate
115-072-003	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-092-006	10,019	MIX	0.35	3,506.58	2,349.41	3	None	Moderate
115-092-024	10,890	MIX	0.35	3,811.50	2,553.71	4	None	Moderate
115-121-016	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-091-007	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-140-013	22,651	MIX	0.35	7,927.92	5,311.71	8	None	Moderate
115-112-003	27,878	MIX	0.35	9,757.44	6,537.48	10	None	Moderate
115-052-012	4,792	MIX	0.35	1,677.06	1,123.63	1	None	Moderate
115-072-012	3,485	MIX	0.35	1,219.68	817.19	1	None	Moderate
115-092-008	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-092-018	4,792	MIX	0.35	1,677.06	1,123.63	1	None	Moderate
115-101-002	3,485	MIX	0.35	1,219.68	817.19	1	None	Moderate
115-112-005	12	MIX	0.35	4,116.42	2,758.00	4	None	Moderate
115-052-014	11,326	MIX	0.35	3,963.96	2,655.85	4	None	Moderate
115-071-002	5,227	MIX	0.35	1,829.52	1,225.78	2	None	Moderate
115-071-003	3,920	MIX	0.35	1,372.14	919.33	1	None	Moderate
115-071-004	6,098	MIX	0.35	2,134.44	1,430.07	2	None	Moderate
115-071-005	4,356	MIX	0.35	1,524.60	1,021.48	1	None	Moderate
115-072-011	2,178	MIX	0.35	762.3	510.74	0	None	Moderate

[Table B-4] Parcel Number	Parcel Site (sq. ft.)	Zoning	Floor-Area Ratio	Maximum Developable Area (sq. ft.)	Maximum Residential Area (sq. ft.)	Adjusted Potential Dwelling Units	On-Site Constraints	Income Group Affordability
115-072-013	3,920	MIX	0.35	1,372.14	919.33	1	None	Moderate
115-072-020	15,246	MIX	0.35	5,336.10	3,575.19	6	None	Moderate
115-092-012	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-092-013	14,375	MIX	0.35	5,031.18	3,370.89	5	None	Moderate
115-092-014	2,178	MIX	0.35	762.30	510.74	0	None	Moderate
115-101-004	6,970	MIX	0.35	2,439.36	1,634.37	2	None	Moderate
115-101-014	37,897	MIX	0.35	13,264.02	8,886.89	14	None	Moderate
115-121-011	3,485	MIX	0.35	1,219.68	817.19	1	None	Moderate
115-121-012	33,541	MIX	0.35	11,739.42	7,865.41	13	None	Moderate
115-121-015	14,375	MIX	0.35	5,031.18	3,370.89	5	None	Moderate
115-121-017	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-140-001	12,632	MIX	0.35	4,421.34	2,962.30	4	None	Moderate
115-052-017	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-052-016	13,939	MIX	0.35	4,878.72	3,268.74	5	None	Moderate
115-071-001	18,295	MIX	0.35	6,403.32	4,290.22	7	None	Moderate
115-091-004	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-091-005	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-091-008	12,197	MIX	0.35	4,268.88	2,860.15	4	None	Moderate
115-091-013	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-133-004	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-051-005	6,970	MIX	0.35	2,439.36	1,634.37	2	None	Moderate
115-052-003	4,792	MIX	0.35	1,677.06	1,123.63	1	None	Moderate
115-052-Q04	4,792	MIX	0.35	1,677.06	1,123.63	1	None	Moderate
115-052-005	4,792	MIX	0.35	1,677.06	1,123.63	1	None	Moderate
115-052-011	5,227	MIX	0.35	1,829.52	1,225.78	2	None	Moderate
115-071-014	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-072-004	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-072-005	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-072-007	6,534	MIX	0.35	2,286.90	1,532.22	2	None	Moderate
115-072-008	7,841	MIX	0.35	2,744.28	1,838.67	3	None	Moderate
115-072-009	14,810	MIX	0.35	5,183.64	3,473.04	5	None	Moderate
115-092-020	9,148	MIX	0.35	3,201.66	2,145.11	3	None	Moderate
115-101-010	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-121-018	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-121-019	11,326	MIX	0.35	3,963.96	2,655.85	4	None	Moderate
115-121-020	4,356	MIX	0.35	1,524.60	1,021.48	1	None	Moderate
115-121-022	2,178	MIX	0.35	762.30	510.74	0	None	Moderate
115-113-007	14,810	MIX	0.35	5,183.64	3,473.04	5	None	Moderate

[Table B-4] Parcel Number	Parcel Site (sq. ft.)	Zoning	Floor-Area Ratio	Maximum Developable Area (sq. ft.)	Maximum Residential Area (sq. ft.)	Adjusted Potential Dwelling Units	On-Site Constraints	Income Group Affordability
115-051-006	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-091-003	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-092-002	11,326	MIX	0.35	3,963.96	2,655.85	4	None	Moderate
115-051-009	15,246	MIX	0.35	5,336.10	3,575.19	6	None	Moderate
115-052-006	7,841	MIX	0.35	2,744.28	1,838.67	3	None	Moderate
115-071-016	12,197	MIX	0.35	4,268.88	2,860.15	4	None	Moderate
115-071-017	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-092-015	2,178	MIX	0.35	762.30	510.74	0	None	Moderate
115-101-009	7,405	MIX	0.35	2,591.82	1,736.52	2	None	Moderate
115-101-013	30,056	MIX	0.35	10,519.74	7,048.23	11	None	Moderate
115-121-021	1,307	MIX	0.35	457.38	306.44	0	None	Moderate
ALL	1,142,157			160,540.38	271,816.40	383		

Table B-5: Other Lots with Mixed-Use Potential

Parcel Number	Zoning Designation	Parcel Size	Income Group Affordability
113-450-003	A-1	4.645	Moderate
113-450-010	A-1	1.775	Moderate
115-020-032	-	0.74	Moderate/Lower
115-020-033	-	0.1	Moderate/Lower
115-051-001	R-1	0.68	Moderate
115-051-007	-	0.44	Moderate/Lower
115-051-010	R-1	0.32	Moderate
115-121-023	R-1	0.17	Moderate
115-121-024	R-1	0.17	Moderate
115-133-005	R-1	0.17	Moderate
115-133-008	G-C	0.2	Moderate
115-134-004	G-C	0.34	Moderate
115-134-005	G-C	0.18	Moderate
115-134-006	G-C	0.51	Moderate
115-140-004	R-1	0.53	Moderate
115-153-004	G-C	0.32	Moderate
115-153-005	G-C	0.18	Moderate
ALL		10.19	

Note: Parcels without zoning designation are excluded from the total

7.2.3 DJ Farms Specific Plan

The DJ Farms Specific Plan area covers 209 acres south of West Main Street (or State Route 166) and west of Guadalupe Street (or SR 1) in the southeastern section of the City. It offers tremendous opportunity for the development of market-rate and affordable housing in addition to public facilities and commercial uses. The 2012 Specific Plan calls for the development of up to 802 housing units on approximately 145 acres. Table B-6 shows the distribution of housing densities in the DJ Farms area. The remaining acreage is for commercial uses, parks and open space, and a school. Housing opportunity at DJ Farms is so much that it alone could potentially meet the City’s regional housing need for a couple of cycles into the future even without development elsewhere in the City.

Table B-6: Full Housing Capacity at DJ Farms Specific Plan Area

Density	Land Available (acres)	Allowable Density (units per acre)	Capacity (dwelling units)	Income-Appropriate Housing
Low	30	Up to 7 units/acre	123	Above Moderate
Medium	71	Up to 8 units/acre	357	Above Moderate
High	45	10-20 units/acre	322	Moderate
Total	145		802	

Source: DJ Farms Specific Plan, August 2012

The DJ Farms Specific Plan area broke ground in 2015, built and sold 130 new housing units by January 2019. As of August 2022, 363 units were built with approval for construction of 377 more.

7.2.4 Small and Large Sites & Suitability of Nonvacant Sites

Most of the available parcels in the central area of Guadalupe are predominantly sites that are smaller than 0.5 acres as Table B-2 shows. Non-vacant sites for mixed-use and ADU units do not count toward meeting RHNA requirements. This is because the City has an abundance of space for housing, which enables the Housing Element to not rely on non-vacant space to accommodate the RHNA. Any use of non-vacant space for housing would be over and above the capacity of vacant units. There are no large sites (over 10 acres each) in Table B-2 in the central area of the City.

7.2.5 People’s Self-Help Housing Project

People’s Self-Help Housing broke ground in January 2019 to add additional 37 low-income units to the Guadalupe Ranch Acres site on 11th street to be called Escalante Meadows. Table A-3b shows the distribution of units all of which are restricted to serve specified low-income categories. With the completion of this project, the City of Guadalupe met practically all its housing need allocation for the new RHNA cycle in the lower income groups. This is an example of qualified and proven entities to acquire and manage affordable housing, which already has a footprint in the City.

7.2.6 Opportunities for Emergency Shelters

Emergency shelters do not require conditional use permits in the zones where they are permitted. Guadalupe permits emergency shelters in residential zones by right, which means there are no requirements for discretionary action. Program 1.6 asks the City to modify permit procedures to allow

emergency shelters in all zones that permit housing without requirements for design review permits and discretionary actions. There is a concentration of opportunities in the downtown area, which is already close to public transit and shopping. This creates a tremendous opportunity to establish emergency shelters in the downtown area with its location efficiency and accessibility to many amenities. The acreage of vacant land is enough to satisfy the City’s need for emergency shelters and other supportive housing.

7.2.7 Conclusions on Inventory of Residential Opportunities

The 2042 General Plan has determined that Guadalupe already has enough land within its City limits to accommodate growth to 2042 and beyond. The 2042 General Plan and this 6th Cycle Housing Element therefore identified enough land for the construction of housing to suit households in all income groups and fulfill the City’s share of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation. Opportunities for housing development include vacant infill, mixed-use, and the DJ Farms sites. Other options, especially for affordable housing, exist in the built-up area for accessory (or secondary) dwelling units (also termed granny units). While it is possible to meet Guadalupe's housing allocation without exercising all these options, they present multiple opportunities for affordable and market rate housing within the City as Table B-7 shows. The City has potential with mixed use and vacant lands to accommodate two and a half times the 6th Cycle RHNA. It is noteworthy that there is additional potential for ADUs and JADUs that Table B-7 does not include. **It is also noteworthy that the numbers of housing units under already approved projects that are under construction or soon to begin construction are sufficient to meet the City’s RHNA plus an overall buffer of 40 percent extra units.**

Table B-7: Summary of Potential for Housing Development in Guadalupe Including 6th Cycle

Source of Space	Lower Income Capacity	Moderate Income Capacity	Above Moderate-Income Capacity	Total Capacity
Table B2: Infill Pipeline Units	118	20	0	138
Table B-3: DJ Farms Pipeline Units	0	74	391	465
Table B-3: Carry-over	53	129	0	182
Table B-4: Mixed-use Downtown	0	380	0	380
Tab B-5: Other Mixed-Use Sites	0	75	0	75
Total	93	674	392	1240
	Green rows count toward 6 th Cycle RHNA (Refer to Table B-1)			

7.3 Appendix C: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

7.3.0 Legislative Basis for Fair Housing

Assembly Bill 686 passed in 2017 requiring Housing Elements to include an analysis of barriers that restrict access to opportunity and commitments from local governments to specific meaningful actions to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH) that are consistent with the Federal Fair Housing Act. AB 686 mandates that local governments identify meaningful goals to address the impacts of systemic issues such as residential segregation, housing cost burden, and unequal educational or employment opportunities in as far as these issues create or perpetuate discrimination against protected classes. Therefore, AB 686 seeks the following:

- Requires the State, cities, counties, and public housing authorities to administer programs and activities related to housing and community development in a way that affirmatively furthers fair housing;
- Prohibits the State, cities, counties, and public housing authorities from taking actions that are materially inconsistent with the AFFH obligation;
- Requires that the interpretation of the AFFH obligation be consistent with HUD’s 2015 regulation, irrespective of federal actions on the regulation;
- Adds an AFFH analysis to the mandated, short-term, Housing Element that are due from the beginning of 2021; and
- Requires that the AFFH analysis in the Housing Element includes an examination of issues such as segregation and resident displacement, as well as the required identification of fair housing goals.

Effective January 1 2021, Government Code section 65583, subdivision (c)(10)(A) requires Housing Elements to include an assessment of fair housing. The discussion is to cover regional and local trends in specified topical areas. The checklist of topics for discussion includes the following five parts:

1. Part 1 Outreach and Fair Housing Enforcement
2. Part 2 Assessment of Fair Housing (in four thematic areas)
3. Part 3 Sites Inventory
4. Part 4 Identification of Contributing Factors
5. Part 5 Goals and Actions

The Assessment of Fair Housing in Part 2 is to include discussion of these four thematic areas:

- a) Integration and segregation patterns and trends
- b) Racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty
- c) Disparities in access to opportunity
- d) Disproportionate housing needs within the jurisdiction, including displacement risk.

The sections that follow describe and analyze these topical areas for Guadalupe.

7.3.1 Fair Housing Outreach & Enforcement

7.3.1.1 Fair Housing Outreach

This housing element is a product of broad community participation by stakeholders of Guadalupe, including residents, City Staff, the School District, Planning Commission, and City Council jointly with the

preparation of the General Plan and specifically for the Housing Element. Input from all segments of the community was to help assure efficient and effective evaluation, development, and implementation of appropriate housing strategies. During preparation of the update to the Housing Element, citizen and stakeholder participation was actively sought in four outreach meetings and two public meetings. Section 1.2 provides additional information on each meeting.

A broad cross-section of residents in terms of ethnicity, income level, and occupation attended the meetings for which there were Spanish translations and versions of materials. Discussions at these workshops and meetings indicate that housing for families and farmworkers is a concern and both single-family and single-room occupancy units are desired to accommodate the need. Residents of Guadalupe also support infill development that is affordable by design in the downtown core of the City. This update of the Housing Element captures these community aspirations for housing.

7.3.1.2 Fair Housing Enforcement

Enforcement refers to activities directed at addressing compliance with fair housing laws. Such actions may include investigation of complaints, putting remedies in place, and disseminating information related to fair housing to assure community members are well aware of fair housing laws and people's rights. There are two key laws to foster fair housing in the State of California. They are the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. These laws cover the same protected classes of persons as federal law and also prohibit discrimination based on marital status, sexual orientation, source of income, ancestry, immigration status, citizenship, primary language, and such arbitrary factors as age or occupation.

Using the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity data in the AFFH Data Viewer 2.0, for the reporting period between 2013 - 2021, there were no inquiries in the City of Guadalupe. In addition, there are no known fair housing lawsuits, findings, settlements, judgments, or complaints within City limits. Residents in Guadalupe can access the County's Fair Housing Counseling for information on fair housing, while local organizations such as the California Rural Legal Assistance Services is available to aid residents who wish to pursue housing discrimination lawsuits. While the City has not had any enforcement complaints within its limits, Program 6.7 commits the City to establishing a method to formally track cases as well as providing a dedicated City employee to assist with any case-specific needs.

Compliance with Fair Housing Laws

Reasonable Accommodation: The City's reasonable accommodation procedures are compliant with state and federal requirements. Program 4.2 commits the City to affirmatively marketing its reasonable accommodation procedures at all times during the 6th cycle housing element planning period and Program 4.7 commits to amending the zoning ordinance to provide flexible permitting processes for large group homes.

Government Code Section 65008 covers actions of a city, county, city and county, or other local government agency, and makes those actions null and void if the action denies an individual or group of individuals the enjoyment of residence, landownership, tenancy, or other land use in the state

because of membership in a protected class, the method of financing, and/or the intended occupancy. The City encourages housing development of all types regardless of size, prospective tenant, or financing source, and supports by-right development in residential zones and mixed-use zones.

Government Code Section 8899.50 requires all public agencies to administer programs and activities relating to housing and community development in a manner to affirmatively further fair housing and avoid any action that is materially inconsistent with its obligation to affirmatively further fair housing. Programs 6.1 to 6.10 commit the City to implement strategies that make progress towards addressing the identified fair housing issues.

Government Code Section 11135 et seq. requires full and equal access to all programs and activities operated, administered, or funded with financial assistance from the state, regardless of one's membership or perceived membership in a protected class. The City adheres to these mandatory requirements when applying for and administering state programs.

Density Bonus Law (Government Code Section 65915 et seq.). Program 4.1 commits the City to completing a comprehensive update of its density bonus implementing procedures for compliance with State density bonus law (SDBL). Post-adoption, Program 1.1 commits to annual review of its density bonus regulations to ensure ongoing consistency with SDBL. Programs 4.6 and 6.8 commit the City to prepare information for property owners and housing developments about density bonus and publishing this content on its website and providing density bonuses and development incentives to qualifying housing developments.

Housing Accountability Act (Government Code Section 65589.5.). The City Planning staff is familiar with recent amendments to the Housing Accountability Act and actively monitors, no less than annually, online resources for legislative updates. Guadalupe tracks new legislation through the state's website as well as follows and receives legislative updates from various legal firms, which includes amendments to the Housing Accountability Act amongst others.

No Net Loss Law (Government Code Section 65863). This housing element meets No Net Loss (NNL) requirements by providing capacity sufficient to meet the RHNA plus a buffer of additional capacity in all income categories. As compliance with NNL requires transactional review of development applications, both ministerial and discretionary, Program 1.1 memorializes and commits the City to conducting this review on a project-by-project basis, and to take the actions as required by State law should an inventory deficit occur as defined in NNL law.

Least Cost Zoning Law (Government Code Section 65913.1). As shown in the Inventory of Sites, Sites for Emergency Shelters, and Lands Available for Residential Development, the City has designated and zoned sufficient vacant land for residential use with appropriate standards to accommodate all income categories identified by the RHNA as verified in the Land Use Element of the 2042 General Plan.

Excessive subdivision standards (Government Code Section 65913.2.). The City complies. The City has no policies, ordinances, or recent practices that impose design controls or public improvement standards for the purpose of rendering development infeasible. Further, the City considers the effect of ordinances adopted and actions taken on the housing needs of the region.

Limits on growth controls (Government Code 65302.8.). The City does not currently impose growth controls or growth management practices.

Regional Trends and Comparisons of Fair Housing Enforcement

The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development - HUD’s - Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) works toward eliminating housing discrimination, promoting economic opportunity, and achieving diverse, inclusive communities. FHEO maintains a dataset of all the Title VIII fair housing cases filed by FHEO from 01/01/2006 to 06/30/2020. Like other key data on Fair Housing, FHEO data is accessible online through the State of California’s Housing and Community Development (HCD) AFFH Data Viewer.

For the purposes of this analysis, the “Guadalupe Region” extends from the City of Paso Robles and the City of Delano in the north to the City of Thousand Oaks in the south. It encompasses cities and smaller communities that are within both the central cost and the Central Valley of California and cut across the four contiguous counties of Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, and Kern.

Table C-1 shows the number of cases in 2010 and 2020 in the counties within the Guadalupe Region. Results indicate that Santa Barbara County had lower frequency of total cases than two of its neighboring counties with disability bias and familial bias as the main reasons for enforcement. What may be promising is the reduction by half in cases in Santa Barbara County between 2010 and 2020, which is similar to the rate in many of the other counties in the region. It is worth noting, however, that the reduction could simply be due to a half-year of data in 2020 which, if true, would mean little to no change in the frequency of enforcement cases between the two years.

Table C-1: Number of Fair Housing Enforcement Cases in Counties near Guadalupe, 2010 and 2020

County	2010				2020				Percent Change (2010-2020)
	Total Cases ¹	Disability Bias	Familial Bias	Racial Bias	Total Cases ¹	Disability Bias	Familial Bias	Racial Bias	
Guadalupe Region									
Ventura	16	7	3	2	5	4			-69%
Santa Barbara	10	8			5	2	2	1	-50%
San Luis Obispo	4	1	3	0	4	1	3	0	0%
Kern	17	9	6	3	9	4	2	0	-47%
<i>Region Total</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>-51%</i>

Source: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022)

¹Note: Cases may involve more than one bias category and other reasons may not be in the dataset.

Figure C-1 and Figure C-2 compare trends in the distribution of the number of FHEO cases in 2010 and 2020 respectively against State averages. The data, which is aggregated at the county level, reveals the following:

- In 2010, Santa Barbara County depicted close to an average level of frequency among counties in the State of California, similar to its neighbor, San Luis Obispo County and lower than Kern and Ventura counties.
- In 2020, Santa Barbara County again depicted close to an average level of frequency among counties in the State of California, but higher than its neighbor, San Luis Obispo County but was similar in frequency to Kern and Ventura counties.
- The pattern for Santa Barbara, therefore worsened relatively between 2010 and 2020.

Local Trends and Analysis

Complaints and Enforcement – The data on fair housing enforcement complaints is available at the county level. And the City of Guadalupe does not keep a record on such complaints. Therefore, it was not possible to analyze local trends on fair housing enforcement cases based on HCD’s AFFH data resources. The element had to rely on local knowledge of city officials and residents. A new Program 6.7 is added for the City to begin record keeping on complaints and enforcement cases related to fair housing. The general sentiment is that Guadalupe has a fair distribution of households by income group and housing type.


Needs of Large Households – Section 2.5.2 discusses Large Households. Its Table 2-25 shows the distribution of occupied housing units by number of persons and tenure for 2019. It provides further insight into the potential for overcrowding. Households with five or more persons occupied just over 40 percent of renter units and nearly 40 percent of owner units. While the share of large renter units was sufficient for the share of large households, the share of large owner units far outweighs the share of large households suggesting affordability issues with owner units for large families. The data does not suggest issues with fairness in the availability of large units. However, to address overcrowding and adequately supply large households with suitable housing, the City can offer incentives to facilitate the development of large housing units with four or more bedrooms. A shortage of large units can be alleviated through inclusionary zoning and community partnerships with entities such as Self-Help Enterprises, Habitat for Humanity, and other affordable housing developers that offer opportunities for affordable housing ownership.

Place-Based Strategies & Targeted Investments – The City has historically distributed affordable renter units of multi-family buildings in similar neighborhoods as single-family housing, which tend for the most part to be market rate. East of State Highway 99, affordable housing includes both single-family and multi-family units. The 2040 General Plan and the Housing Element also plan for the conversion of downtown to mixed-use not only for mixture of lower-income and moderate-income housing, but also to enable location efficiency and ease of access to the basic necessities of life for residents. Planned new developments, such as the Milicic Development, which are proposed for the western end of the City also

include a mixture of single-family and multi-family units. These place-based strategies in the distribution of housing help to preserve and revitalize housing affordability, choice, and availability, thereby fostering geographic mobility, minimizing displacement, and furthering fair housing. Table 6.4 includes programs on place-based strategies.


Investments & Disinvestments – The place-based strategies identified in the previous paragraph reflect investment in housing to suit a wide range of income groups across the City in a bid to foster investment in resource areas and to prevent disinvestment in older areas, such as downtown, which offer opportunities for location efficiency and fair housing. Location efficiency can be cost effective for residents in terms of accessibility while it makes housing affordable for them and prevent abandonment or deterioration of older areas with potential for convenient living.

Figure C-1: Distribution of Fair Housing Enforcement Cases in Guadalupe & Region, 2010



Source: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022

Figure C-2: Distribution of Fair Housing Enforcement Cases in Guadalupe & Region, 2020



Source: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022

7.3.2 Assessment of Fair Housing

Guadalupe is a predominantly Hispanic community. In 2020, for instance, 92 percent of City residents claimed Hispanic origin. The assessment of affirmatively furthering fair housing (AFFH) discusses patterns and trends in socio-economic characteristics within the City and between the City and its region. The following subsections elaborate.

7.3.2.1 Integration and segregation patterns and trends

Integration refers to the situation when groups of varied demographic or socioeconomic characteristics mix in a geographic area resulting in even or proportional distribution of the groups within the area.

Segregation is the separation of groups of varied demographic or socioeconomic characteristics into different geographic areas, resulting in uneven or disproportional distribution of the groups across geographic locations. This subsection discusses integration and segregation in the study area in terms of race and ethnic composition, populations with disabilities, household types, income groups, and trends in housing choice vouchers.

7.3.2.1-a Race and ethnic composition

The Fair Housing Act prohibits housing discrimination on the basis of race or ethnicity. Therefore, racial and ethnic composition of areas become useful considerations in analyzing housing demand, opportunity, acceptance, and other issues that relate to fairness in obtaining or keeping housing.

Regional Trends and Comparisons

Table C-2 reveals that the City of Guadalupe depicted slightly higher racial diversity than Santa Barbara County and neighboring counties in 2021. Guadalupe's dominant racial groups were white (making up nearly half of the population), some other race (making up a quarter of the population), and two or more races (making up a fifth of the population). The shares of the white population ranged from approximately 60 percent to 80 percent among the counties in the region and therefore were noticeably higher than Guadalupe. There were clear differences in the distribution of the races between the City and the counties in the region. Table C-3 shows similar data for 2010 and confirms the persistence of the trends over the decade.

Tables C-2 and C-3 also reveal that Guadalupe is a predominantly Hispanic community. This stems partially from its high dependence on an agriculture related economic base. The difference between Guadalupe and the region is most noticeable in Hispanic origin. While approximately a quarter to half of residents in the counties within the region claimed Hispanic origin, most of the City residents or between 85 percent and 90 percent claimed Hispanic origin in 2010 and 2021, respectively. Since persons of Hispanic origin are generally considered "minorities," one can also conclude that the City of Guadalupe is a predominantly minority community. Therefore, Guadalupe appears more integrated and less segregated in racial composition, but not so in ethnic **composition** in comparison to its region.

Table C-2: Population by Race/Ethnicity - Guadalupe City & Region, 2021

	Kern County, California		San Luis Obispo County, California		Santa Barbara County, California		Ventura County, California		Guadalupe city, California	
Race and Ethnicity	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent
Racial Distribution										
White	564,183	62.30%	225,822	79.90%	294,936	65.90%	592,773	70.10%	3,959.00	48.60%
Black or African American	48741	5.40%	4,237	1.50%	8,423	1.90%	15,486	1.80%	21.00	0.30%
American Indian and Alaska Native	8842	1.00%	2,371	0.80%	5,318	1.20%	9,584	1.10%	89.00	1.10%
Asian	43812	4.80%	10,137	3.60%	24,633	5.50%	61,322	7.30%	396.00	4.90%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1214	0.10%	309	0.10%	656	0.10%	1,677	0.20%	94.00	1.20%
Some other race	124,568	13.80%	12,831	4.50%	50,790	11.30%	58,603	6.90%	,027.00	24.90%
Two or more races	114,284	12.60%	27,064	9.60%	62,895	14.10%	105,810	12.50%	1,552.00	19.10%
Total Population	905,644	100%	282,771	100%	447,651	100%	845,255	100%	,138.00	100%
Hispanic Origin										
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	495,742	54.70%	65,588	23.20%	207,554	46.40%	366,211	43.30%	7,178.00	88.20%
Not Hispanic or Latino	409,902	45.30%	217,183	76.80%	240,097	53.60%	479,044	56.70%	960.00	11.80%
All Origins	905,644	100.00%	282,771	100.00%	447,651	100.00%	845,255	100.00%	,138.00	100.00%

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05

Table C-3: Population by Race/Ethnicity - Guadalupe City & Region, 2010

	Kern County, California		San Luis Obispo County, California		Santa Barbara County, California		Ventura County, California		Guadalupe city, California	
Race and Ethnicity	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent
Racial Distribution										
White	537,410	65.90%	223,464	84.10%	317,602	76.30%	559,845	69.20%	5,476.00	80.90%
Black or African American	45273	5.60%	5,666	2.10%	7,976	1.90%	14,532	1.80%	45.00	0.70%
American Indian and Alaska Native	8367	1.00%	2,539	1.00%	4,162	1.00%	9,881	1.20%	78.00	1.20%
Asian	32097	3.90%	8,158	3.10%	20,663	5.00%	55,733	6.90%	174.00	2.60%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	947	0.10%	349	0.10%	804	0.20%	1,411	0.20%	-	0.00%
Some other race	159,750	19.60%	16,823	6.30%	50,387	12.10%	137,640	17.00%	856.00	12.60%
Two or more races	31,849	3.90%	8,578	3.20%	14,457	3.50%	30,038	3.70%	141.00	2.10%
Total Population	815,693	100%	265,577	100%	416,051	100%	809,080	100%	6,770.00	100%
Hispanic Origin										
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	388,756	47.70%	52,751	19.90%	170,439	41.00%	315,604	39.00%	5,742.00	84.80%
Not Hispanic or Latino	426,937	52.30%	212,826	80.10%	245,612	59.00%	493,476	61.00%	1,028.00	15.20%

	Kern County, California		San Luis Obispo County, California		Santa Barbara County, California		Ventura County, California		Guadalupe city, California	
Race and Ethnicity	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent
All Origins	815,693	100.00%	265,577	100.00%	416,051	100.00%	809,080	100.00%	6,770.00	100.00%


Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05

Local Trends and Analysis

Within City comparisons are between neighborhoods as discerned from residents and local officials, housing type, income, and other socioeconomic characteristics in the Guadalupe 2042 General Plan. Figure C-3 identifies six neighborhoods within the City. The community perceives the City as falling into six neighborhoods (which Figure C-3 shows). Households and families of all income groups occur in all the neighborhoods. Similarly, multifamily housing and assisted housing facilities occur in neighborhoods on both sides of Highway 1. There are two minor exceptions:

- The historical distribution of housing in the City depicts spreading of multiple income types across the community. The Housing Element acknowledges this phenomenon and encourages the distribution of affordable housing throughout various neighborhoods in the City. Encouragements include allowing Accessory Dwellings in single family neighborhoods and promoting duplexes, SB 9 lot splits, or lot consolidations elsewhere to enable construction of multi-family units. DJ Farms is the newest neighborhood located just south of Hwy 166 across from the original boundary. With its proximity to the old neighborhoods which have suitable parcels for lower income housing, there is no segregation by income. Thus, the sites do not exacerbate housing conditions.
- In addition, Pasadera, the newest neighborhood to the south primarily serves housing needs in the moderate to above moderate-income groups. The part of RHNA that this development holds is more to satisfy the regional need than the local need.
- Similarly, The Gularte Tract in the northeast neighborhood has a concentration of older homes and a more than average concentration of households in the lower income groups. However, it also has the newest, most attractive housing development for assisted and very low-income households. Additionally, it has moderate income apartments that are already under construction.

Figure C-3: 2020 Neighborhood Designations within the City of Guadalupe



Source: City of Guadalupe General Plan

Figures C-4 and C-5 show the concentrations of persons of Hispanic ethnicity in Guadalupe and its immediate region for 2010 and 2020, respectively. It is noteworthy that the concentration is more pronounced in Guadalupe than neighboring cities.

Within Guadalupe, differences in ethnic composition varied only slightly by neighborhood in 2010. The highest concentrations (above 74 percent) existed in the predominantly residential neighborhood of Downtown, Northeast, West, and Obispo; the Pasadera neighborhood was not yet in existence. In 2020, the composition became rather uniformly high, rising between 75 percent and 100 percent of the population in all neighborhoods except the new Pasadera neighborhood, which nevertheless reflected between 50 percent and 75 percent Hispanic origin in the population. Overall, the percentage increased by census block from an average of 83 percent in 2010 to 86 percent in 2020.

Trends and Patterns

It is discernible from Tables C-2 and C-3 as well as Figures C-4 and C-5 that trends in Hispanic residency have persisted and intensified across the region. In Guadalupe, the concentration of Hispanic residents increased between 2010 and 2020 to make it a de facto Hispanic community.


Other Relevant Factors

The typical pattern in the composition of labor pools by race and ethnicity indicates a more than proportionate concentration of persons of Hispanic origin in the agricultural sector, especially in California. As a geographical center of agricultural production in the State, the Santa Maria Valley of California has a high concentration of agricultural workers. Since Guadalupe is located in the Santa Maria Valley and its economic base is predominantly agricultural, it follows reason that most of its residents are Hispanic. It is also notable that incomes are much lower in the agricultural sector than many other sectors of the economy. The issue of affordability of housing would gain prominence in such a community. Conventional knowledge indicates that Hispanics tend to have larger families than other races in the US. The average household size in Guadalupe was 4.0 persons in 2020 compared to 2.85 in Santa Barbara County. This would suggest the need for large housing units even as the units are affordable.

Conclusion


Segregation and integration are not key issues in Guadalupe. Population data indicates steady growth which would suggest the need for a steady supply of housing. The comparatively low incomes, the youthful population, and relatively large household and family sizes could indicate the need for affordable housing to suit large families among other special needs groups.

Figure C-4: 2010 Concentrations of Hispanic Population by Census Block in Guadalupe Neighborhoods



Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2010 Decennial Census, Table P2

Figure C-5: 2020 Concentrations of Hispanic Population by Census Block in Guadalupe and its Region



Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census, Table P2

7.3.2.1-b Populations with disabilities

The Fair Housing Act prohibits housing discrimination on the basis of disability. The US Census Bureau identifies persons with any one of six impairments as having a disability. The impairments may relate to hearing, vision, cognitive, ambulatory, self-care, and independent living. Persons with disabilities may have special housing needs because of the higher health costs associated with the disability or inaccessibility and unaffordability of housing. Additionally, many persons with disability could depend on fixed incomes which could further limit housing options for them. Also, the disability status and the types of accommodations associated with them sometimes can make them victims of housing discrimination.

Regional Trends and Comparisons

Figures C-6 and C-7 show the concentrations of persons with disability by census tract in Guadalupe and its region for 2014 and 2019, respectively. The concentration measured as percent of population varied widely across the region and within Santa Barbara County. The two maps reveal that the levels of concentration in the region reduced between 2014 and 2019 compared to the respective statewide averages. Overall, the percentages of persons with disabilities were close among counties in the region but varied widely by race, age, and type of disability as Table C-4 shows.

Local Trends and Analysis

With tract-level data one could not distinguish the concentrations in populations with disability among neighborhoods within Guadalupe. Citywide, while the concentration was close to the state average in 2014, it fell below the state average in 2019.


Table C-4: Incidence of Disability in the Guadalupe Region, 2019

	Santa Barbara County	Kern County	San Luis Obispo County	Ventura County
<i>Civilian non-institutionalized population</i>	9.9%	11.1%	11.6%	10.9%
Race/Ethnicity				
Black or African American alone	16.2%	15.6%	10.2%	13.6%
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	15.3%	15.6%	15.9%	13.2%
Asian alone	6.5%	7.9%	8.5%	8.7%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	14.9%	8.1%	15.7%	7.2%
Some other race alone	7.8%	11.3%	11.9%	8.4%
Two or more races	11.3%	12.1%	9.7%	9.1%
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino	12.5%	17.1%	12.8%	13.1%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	7.4%	6.9%	8.5%	8.9%
Age				
Under 5 years	0.4%	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%
5 to 17 years	3.9%	4.2%	5.1%	5.0%
18 to 34 years	4.9%	5.9%	5.0%	5.4%
35 to 64 years	9.6%	13.2%	10.2%	9.3%
65 to 74 years	19.8%	29.9%	20.6%	22.2%
75 years and over	45.1%	50.8%	44.0%	51.3%
Type				
Hearing difficulty	3.2%	2.8%	4.2%	3.4%
Vision difficulty	1.6%	2.3%	2.0%	2.1%
Cognitive difficulty	4.0%	4.5%	4.3%	4.5%
Ambulatory difficulty	4.7%	6.4%	5.3%	6.0%
Self-care difficulty	1.9%	2.6%	2.1%	2.7%
Independent living difficulty	4.3%	5.8%	4.4%	5.6%

Sources: U.S Census Bureau, 2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1810


Santa Barbara County, 2023 – 2031 Housing Element, Table D-6

Figure C-6: 2014 Concentrations of Disability Populations in Guadalupe and its Region



Source: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022

Figure C-7: 2019 Concentrations of Disability Populations in Guadalupe and its Region



Source: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022

7.3.2.1-c Household type or family status

The Fair Housing Act prohibits housing discrimination on the basis of family status or household type. Family status refers to the presence of children under the age of 18, pregnant women, or persons in the process of securing legal custody of a minor child whether by adoption or foster parenting. Household type refers to such characteristics as family or non-family groups, marriage, male or female heads, or single parenting.

Regional Trends and Comparisons

Tables C-5 and C-6 show the distribution of households and family types in the Guadalupe region in 2010 and 2019, respectively. In 2010, family households dominated across the region ranging from 78 percent in San Luis Obispo County to 90 percent in Kern County and 95 percent in Guadalupe. By 2019, family households remained dominant but reduced in shares across the board ranging from 63 percent in San Luis Obispo County to 74 percent in Kern County and 82 percent in Guadalupe.

Local Trends and Analysis

Similarly, Tables C-5 and C-6 show county-level and city-level data but revealed that Guadalupe maintained the highest share of family households among other cities in the region. **The tables reveal that at 21 percent, the proportion of female-headed household remained relatively high compared to neighboring cities and neighboring counties in both 2010 and 2019. While there is no single determinant of the higher rate of female-headed households, the City will look to target County programs to assist female-headed and single-parent households in Guadalupe.**

Table C-5: Distribution of Household/Family Types in the Guadalupe Region, 2010

Household/Family Type	Kern County	San Luis Obispo County	Santa Barbara County	Ventura County	Guadalupe City
Total Households	802,874	252,631	406,113	812,718	7,080
Family households	90%	78%	81%	88%	95%
Married couple family	63%	60%	61%	68%	64%
Other family	27%	17%	20%	20%	31%
Male householder, no spouse present	9%	6%	7%	7%	10%
Female householder, no spouse present	18%	11%	13%	13%	21%
Nonfamily households	10%	22%	19%	12%	5%
Households with a male householder	6%	11%	9%	6%	3%
1-person household	3%	5%	4%	3%	1%
2-or-more-person household	3%	7%	6%	3%	1%
Households with a female householder	5%	11%	10%	6%	2%
1-person household	3%	6%	5%	4%	2%

2-or-more-person household	1%	5%	5%	2%	1%
-------------------------------	----	----	----	----	----

Sources: U.S Census Bureau, 2010 Decennial Census, Table P30

Table C-6: Distribution of Household/Family Types in the Guadalupe Region, 2019

Household Type	Santa Barbara County	Kern County	San Luis Obispo County	Ventura County
Total Households	145,856	270,282	105,981	271,040
Family Households	66%	74%	63%	73%
Married Couple Family	49%	51%	51%	55%
Male householder, no spouse present	5%	7%	4%	5%
Female householder, no spouse present	11%	16%	9%	12%
Non-family Households	34%	26%	37%	28%
Householder living alone	24%	21%	26%	22%

Household Type	Buellton	Carpinteria	Guadalupe	Lompoc	Santa Barbara	Santa Maria	Solvang
Total Households	1,941	5,089	2,030	13,027	37,333	27,868	2,380
Family Households	73%	64%	82%	69%	53%	80%	69%
Married Couple Family	52%	52%	51%	47%	40%	52%	54%
Male Householder, no spouse present	8%	4%	11%	9%	4%	9%	1%
Female Householder, no spouse present	13%	7%	21%	14%	9%	18%	14%
Non-family Households	27%	36%	18%	31%	47%	20%	31%
Householder living alone	19%	27%	16%	25%	32%	16%	19%

Sources: U.S Census Bureau, 2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
Santa Barbara County, 2023 – 2031 Housing Element, Table D-9 & D-10

7.3.2.1-d Income groups

Household and family income levels are key to housing affordability. The concentration of populations of various income levels in geographic areas affect perception of wealth of residents and have implications for integration and segregation of populations. The income profiles of areas have direct relationship to issues about fair housing especially for those in lower income brackets. Ultimately, the share of income spent on housing reflects affordability for respective income groups no matter how high or low the income or whether the household owns or rents housing. Housing that requires 30 percent or more of household income is unaffordable.

Regional Trends and Comparisons

Table C-7 compares median incomes in 2010 and 2020 across the Guadalupe region. In both years, median incomes were close between Santa Barbara County and San Luis Obispo County, noticeably lower compared to Ventura County, and noticeably higher compared to Kern County. The table also reveals that lower median incomes correlated with higher levels of poverty in the population. Over the decade, median incomes grew by 16 percent in Kern County and 36 percent in San Luis Obispo County. The percent of residents below the poverty level also increased slightly in the counties over the decade except for San Luis Obispo County where it fell by 15 percent.

Figures C-8 and C-9 show the percentages of homeowners by census tract who paid 30 percent or more of their incomes on housing in 2014 and 2019, respectively. In 2014, tracts in cities within the region indicate that 20 percent to 60 percent of owners paid more than 30 percent of incomes on housing. Effectively, one can conclude that home ownership was generally unaffordable across the region. In 2019, the situation improved slightly for owners across the region. One would assume that home prices fell, or incomes went up, or more wealthy persons took over much of the housing. or multiple income earners shared in the housing cost per unit.

Figures C-10 and C-11 show the percentages of renters by census tract who paid 30 percent or more of their incomes on housing in 2014 and 2019, respectively. Similarly in 2014, tracts in cities within the region indicate that 40 percent to 80 percent of renters paid more than 30 percent of incomes on housing. Effectively, one can conclude that rental housing was noticeably unaffordable in communities across the region. In 2019, the situation improved slightly for renters across the region. One would assume that home prices fell, or incomes went up, or more wealthy persons took over much of the housing. or multiple income earners shared in the rental housing cost per unit.

Table C-7: 2010 and 2020 Median Incomes and Poverty Levels in the Guadalupe Region

Income and Poverty	Kern County	San Luis Obispo County	Santa Barbara County	Ventura County	Guadalupe City	
2010					Percent of Santa Barbara County	
Median income	\$47,089	\$57,365	\$60,078	\$75,348	\$42,978	72%
Below poverty level	18%	13%	12%	8%	17%	
2020						
Median income	\$54,851	\$77,948	\$78,925	\$89,295	\$55,511	70%
Below poverty level	19%	11%	12%	8%	24%	
Percent change 2010 to 2020						
Median income	16%	36%	31%	19%	29%	
Below poverty level	7%	-15%	2%	5%	45%	

Sources: U.S Census Bureau, 2010 & 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S2201


Local Trends and Analysis

Data was not detailed enough to make comparisons by neighborhood. Table C-7 reveal that Guadalupe historically depicted lower median incomes than Santa Barbara and the other counties in the region. It also depicted a higher percentage of persons living below the poverty line than the counties in the region. Over the decade, while Guadalupe’s median income increased by 29 percent, the percentage of residents living below the poverty level increased by nearly half or 45 percent.

Using Figures C-8, C-9, C-10, and C-11, the census tract within which Guadalupe falls depicted similar trends as the region. For homeowners, Guadalupe was in the 20 percent to 40 percent range in 2014


and the situation improved in 2019 when less than 20 percent of owners had unaffordable housing costs. For renters, the situation was worse in 2014 when 40 percent to 60 percent of renters had to pay unaffordable cost for housing and the situation remained the same in 2019.

Figure C-8: Percent of Homeowners Paying >30% of Incomes on Housing, Guadalupe Region, 2014




Source: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022

Figure C-9: Percent of Homeowners Paying >30% of Incomes on Housing, Guadalupe Region, 2019




Source: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022

Figure C-10: Percent of Renters Paying >30% of Incomes on Housing, Guadalupe Region, 2014



Source: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022

Figure C-11: Percent of Renters Paying >30% of Incomes on Housing, Guadalupe Region, 2019



Source: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022

7.3.2.1-e Trends in housing choice vouchers

The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) explains the housing choice voucher (HCV) program as *“the federal government's major program for assisting very low-income families, the elderly, and disabled people to afford decent, safe, and sanitary housing in the private market. Since housing assistance is provided on behalf of the family or individual, participants are able to find their own housing, including single-family homes, townhouses and apartments.”*

(https://www.hud.gov/topics/housing_choice_voucher_program_section_8)

Public housing agencies (PHAs) receive federal funds from HUD to administer the voucher program. Notably, participants are free to choose any housing that meets the requirements of the program and are not limited to units located in subsidized housing projects. The PHA pays a housing subsidy directly to the landlord on behalf of the participant. The family then pays the difference between the actual rent and the amount the program subsidizes. With authorization from the PHA, a participant may use the voucher to purchase a modest home under certain circumstances.

A key objective of the program is to help participants get out of poverty. Therefore, if the use of HCV concentrates participants in areas of high poverty because of low rents in those areas, then segregation into enclaves of poverty can occur and it defeats integration.


Regional Trends and Comparisons

Figure C-12 shows the locations of subsidized housing projects in the Guadalupe region in 2021. They do appear in all urbanized areas across the region and are more frequent in larger urban areas. The map reveals that subsidized housing units tended to distribute through the respective cities in the region.

Local Trends and Analysis


Figure C-13 shows the locations of subsidized housing projects within the City of Guadalupe in 2021. The map reveals that subsidized housing units distribute across the City instead of clustering into any particular enclave. This is consistent with the integration objective of the housing choice voucher program.

Figure C-12: Locations of Subsidized Housing Projects in the Guadalupe Region, 2021



Source: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022

Figure C-13: Locations of Subsidized Housing Projects within Guadalupe and Vicinity, 2021



Source: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022

7.3.2.2 Racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty

HUD has developed a definition of racially/ethnically-concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs). The definition combines thresholds for racial/ethnic concentration and poverty. Census tracts with extreme poverty that satisfy the racial/ethnic concentration thresholds are deemed R/ECAPs as follows:


- **The threshold for racial/ethnic concentration** flags R/ECAPs with concentrations of non-white populations:
 - In relatively large, urbanized areas for up to Core Based Statistical Areas (CBSAs), which are urban centers of at least 10,000 people plus adjacent counties that are tied to the urban centers socioeconomically by commuting, census blocks with 50 percent or more of non-white populations qualify as R/ECAPS.
 - In smaller areas outside of CBSAs and larger geographies which are unlikely to have racial or ethnic concentrations as high as 50 percent, the racial/ethnic concentration threshold is set at 20 percent.
- **The threshold for extreme poverty** typically defines neighborhoods of extreme poverty as census tracts with 40 percent or more of individuals living at or below the poverty line. Because overall poverty levels are substantially lower in many parts of the country, HUD supplements the typical with an alternate criterion. Thus, a neighborhood meets the poverty qualification for R/ECAP based on the lower of two poverty thresholds:
 - If it has a poverty rate that exceeds 40 percent.
 - If it is three or more times the average tract poverty rate for its metropolitan or micropolitan area.

Similarly, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) convened a group of independent organizations and research centers in February 2017 that became the California Fair Housing Task Force. TCAC and HCD charged the Task Force with the creation of an opportunity map to identify areas in every region of the State where research supports the need for positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income families and especially in the long-term outcomes for children.

Regional Trends and Comparisons


Figure C-14, Figure C-15, Figure C-16, and Figure C-17 depict trends in the incidence of race and ethnic concentrations of poverty within Guadalupe and its region in 2000, 2010, 2013, and 2020, respectively. The maps reveal that such concentrations were rare within the region. Such incidences appeared in Atascadero, (which is a city in San Luis Obispo County to the north of Guadalupe) by 2010 and remained thereafter. As of 2020, such incidences remained extremely low in Guadalupe and most of the region in comparison to the state average.

Figure C-14: Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty in Guadalupe & Region, 2000




Sources: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022. Decennial census (2000)

Figure C-15: Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty in Guadalupe & Region, 2010




Sources: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022. Decennial census (2010)

Figure C-16: Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty in Guadalupe & Region, 2013



Sources: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022. American Community Survey (ACS), 2009-2013

Figure C-17: Composite Opportunity Areas in Guadalupe & Region, 2020



Sources: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022. Original data sourced from: <https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity/2020.asp>

Local Trends and Analysis

Available data did not show that Guadalupe's neighborhoods had such areas of poverty from 2000 through 2020. Given that most of the population in Guadalupe is Hispanic, neighborhoods of noticeably low income could become ethnically concentrated areas of poverty, but available data did not confirm that situation. Figures C-18 and C-19 reveal that concentrations of non-Hispanic whites was low within the census blocks that make up Guadalupe neighborhoods. The most noticeable concentrations were in the downtown neighborhood in 2010. Overall, the percentage decreased by census block from an average of 11 percent in 2010 to 8 percent in 2020.

It is noteworthy that the City as a whole falls predominantly in the lower income categories. Prior to 2020, comparative median income data confirmed the need for more affordable housing in Guadalupe than some other communities in the region. Since Guadalupe depicted approximately 70 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI), it fell under the classification of a "disadvantaged community" according to the criteria of the State of California.

By 2020 after the Pasadera housing development came online with residents largely in the moderate and above moderate-income brackets, median income in Guadalupe increased although it remained one of the three lowest in Santa Barbara County. With a median income in 2020 of \$68,000 (81% of AMI) Guadalupe barely exceeded the 80 percent threshold to be classified as disadvantaged. Indeed, many residents remained in the lower income categories. This provides further justification for relatively more affordable housing to adequately accommodate the many lower income residents of the City.

With the exception of the newer Pasadera neighborhood, there is not a great deal of confirming there is not a great deal of differences in median household incomes between neighborhoods in the City. With racial demographics being relatively homogeneous across neighborhoods in the City, the slightly lower incomes outside of Pasadera may be notable but does not create a condition of "High Segregation and Poverty" within the City.

While Table 6-4 highlights AFFH actions and programs that are targeted to these areas, it should be noted that previous investments in the City have been proportional when considering a north/south division among the demographics of the City.

Lastly, information from City officials suggests that differences between neighborhoods in the City are fairly minimal. The housing stock in the older neighborhoods north of Hwy 166 are obviously older than in Pasadera, but do not show any signs of higher concentrations of units lacking plumbing or a complete kitchens. Furthermore, the largest park in the City is located within the northwester neighborhood, although services like grocery stores, laundromats, and gas stations are concentrated in the downtown.

Transportation improvement made all across the City include enhanced pedestrian crosswalks with crossing signals and buttons as well as sidewalk extensions utilizing the Active Transportation Program (ATP) grants from the State of California.

As noted in other sections of the housing element, the most recent development in the City has occurred south of Highway 166, particularly in the Pasadera neighborhood of the City. As a result,

streets, sidewalks, and infrastructure in these areas tend to be newer than in the older neighborhoods. However, this does not indicate that older neighborhoods are lacking adequate infrastructure, but rather that the existing infrastructure has been maintained and is in satisfactory condition.

Sidewalks in the City are generally in fair condition, with a few exceptions. According to a windshield survey conducted by City staff, areas to the west of town were among the more recent developments and areas to the east along Obispo Street were built at the same time and continue remain in good condition. However, sections in the center of town have “inconsistent” sidewalks, which include a combination of paved and unpaved sidewalks. Improvements to these areas are incorporated into the City’s Capital Improvement Program, programmed in conjunction with other improvements, including handicap, accessibility ramps, storm drain, culverts, and street paving, consistent with recommendations in the Programs adopted within the Circulation Element of the General Plan.

Of the two existing schools in Guadalupe one is located in the center of town and the other is located on Highway 166 west of Highway 1. A new middle school is under construction south of Highway 166 within the new Pasadera neighborhood. The City also completed a Safe Routes to Schools program which included installation of sidewalks, crosswalks, ADA curb ramps, and curb and gutter improvements at various locations on the routes leading to the schools.

The City already has a bridge that connects the eastern neighborhoods with the commercial center across the Southern Pacific Rail lines. There are discussions to add community art work to the existing pedestrian overpass across the railroad.

Access to community facilities in the northern neighborhoods is going to be enhanced when grant-funded improvements are made to the two largest park, Leroy Park and Central Park. Existing facilities to be upgraded include bathrooms, walkways, waste collection receptacles, etc.

Lastly, the City’s planned growth area are located in Pasadera to the south and the Gularte area to the northeast. The latter was rezoned for higher density (up to 20 units per acre) in order to redevelop the area.

Trends and Patterns

Figures C-14 through C-17 show that trends of minimal incidence in concentrations of poverty persisted across the region from 2000 to 2010 and beyond. It is noteworthy, however, that minority populations were generally low in the region. Guadalupe, which had a relatively higher incidence of minorities in the region, also had a dominant Hispanic population. This could create the potential for large enough concentrations of Hispanic populations who lived in poverty to meet the criteria.


Other Relevant Factors

The interplay of low incomes and higher housing costs in California than other parts of the nation mean high burdens of housing cost among households. Concentrations of poverty or not, the problem with affordability of housing is pervasive across the State.

Conclusion


Relatively low incomes vis-à-vis relatively large families and households with relatively high unemployment can lead to poverty. That is no longer the situation in Guadalupe. Household sizes are large but more families in the City are in higher income groups. The 2020 unemployment rate of 3.9 percent compared favorably to the County rate of 5.7 percent. There remains, however, many family units in the City within those income categories in need of affordable housing. The relatively homogeneous ethnic composition in Guadalupe all but eliminates the issue of poverty concentrations by racial enclaves but the City's Hispanic dominance can create ethnic concentrations of poverty.

Figure C-18: Concentrations of Non-Hispanic Whites in Guadalupe Neighborhoods, 2010



Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2010 Decennial Census, Table P2

Figure C-19: Concentrations of Non-Hispanic Whites in Guadalupe Neighborhoods, 2020



Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census, Table P2

7.3.2.3 Disparities in access to opportunity

Research shows that places have independent and inter-related effects on such critical life outcomes as educational attainment, earnings from employment, and economic mobility. Different places present different levels of opportunity to achieve these critical life outcomes as well as housing choice. Mapping is a way to measure and visualize place-based characteristics linked to opportunity. Results of the analyses can inform how to target investments and policies to achieve beneficial economic, educational, health, and housing outcomes. It is noteworthy, however, that opportunity mapping has limitations since the accuracy of maps depends on the accuracy of the data which may derive from self-reported surveys of subsets of an area's population, and sometimes may not be recorded or be reliable in some areas.

The County of Santa Barbara has determined opportunity indices based on HUD criteria. The County notes that the federal government has repealed the Federal AFFH Rule, but the data and mapping tool to aid preparation of the AFFH remains useful in determining segregation and disparities in access to opportunity. (County of Santa Barbara, 2023 – 2031 Housing Element). The definitions of various opportunity indices are as follows:


- *School Proficiency*: This index applies school-level data on the performance of 4th grade students on State exams to describe neighborhoods in the proximity of high-performing and low-performing elementary schools. The higher the value of the index, the higher is the quality of the school system serving the neighborhood.
- *Labor Market Engagement*: This index summarizes the relative intensity of labor market engagement and human capital in a neighborhood based on the level of employment, labor force participation, and educational attainment within the applicable census tract. The higher the value of the index, the higher is the labor force participation and human capital in the neighborhood.
- *Transit Access*: This index is based on estimates of transit trips taken by a single-parent family with three persons and income at 50 percent of the median income for renters in the region, which is defined as the Core-Based Statistical Area (CBSA). The higher the value of the index, the more likely it is that residents in that neighborhood would use public transit.
- *Transportation Cost*: This index is based on estimates of transportation costs for a single-parent family with three persons and income at 50 percent of the median income for renters in the region, which is defined as the Core-Based Statistical Area (CBSA). The higher the value of the index, the lower the cost of transportation in that neighborhood.
- *Proximity to Jobs*: This index estimates the accessibility of a residential neighborhood as an inverse function of its distances to all job locations within a region (CBSA) and a direct function of the sizes of the employment centers. The higher the value of the index, the better the access to employment opportunities for residents in the neighborhood.

- *Environmental Health*: This index summarizes potential exposure to harmful toxins at the neighborhood level. The higher the value of the index, the lower the exposure to toxins that are harmful to human health. Therefore, the higher the index value, the better the environmental quality of the neighborhood, which is defined as a census block-group.

Regional Trends and Comparisons

Figure C-20 depicts the levels of resource availability in Guadalupe and its region in 2020. Within the Guadalupe region, population centers in northern San Luis Obispo County to the north and southern Santa Barbara County to the south feature varying levels of opportunity measured in levels of resource availability which range from low to high. Guadalupe together with Santa Maria fall to the lower end of the range with the classification of low-resource.

Figure C-20: Levels of Resource Availability in Guadalupe & Region, 2020



Sources: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022.

Educational attainment and level of training affect job opportunities a person qualifies to hold. And the number and type of new future jobs affect future housing needs. Table C-8 shows comparative

opportunity Indices in 2020 for School Proficiency in the four counties in the Guadalupe region (County of Santa Barbara, 2023 – 2031 Housing Element, Table D-17). Based on school-level data on the performance of 4th grade students on State exams, the indices reflect proximity of neighborhoods to high-performing and low-performing elementary schools. The higher the index, the higher the quality of the school systems.

With indices ranging from 57 to 78, San Luis Obispo County had the highest indices within the region across all races and ethnicity as well as for residents living below the poverty level with indices ranging from 60 to 80. Black and Asian or Pacific Islander residents had the highest indices while Hispanic residents had the lowest.

Kern County had the lowest indices within the region ranging from 21 to 31. For residents living below the poverty level, the index range of 13 to 29 suggests even more difficult access to education. White residents had the highest indices while Black and Hispanic residents had the lowest.

Indices for Santa Barbara County fell in the middle of the range from approximately 26 to 45 generally. For populations below the poverty level, the range was a tad lower ranging from 20 to 45. White residents had the highest indices while Black and Hispanic residents had the lowest.

Table C-8: Comparative opportunity Indices for School Proficiency in the Guadalupe Region, 2020

Race/Ethnicity	Santa Barbara County	Kern County	San Luis Obispo County	Ventura County
White	44.75	29.21	67.04	56.08
Black	34.79	21.60	78.12	35.82
Hispanic	25.92	21.24	56.87	31.05
Asian or Pacific Islander	42.89	31.41	71.88	58.11
Native American	38.06	26.00	62.84	40.53
Population Below Federal Poverty Level				
White	44.55	21.99	74.70	46.24
Black	20.49	12.89	74.86	37.34
Hispanic	21.38	18.55	59.63	24.33
Asian or Pacific Islander	53.99	28.79	80.88	46.79
Native American	36.39	22.12	70.77	21.32

Sources: HUD, 2020; County of Santa Barbara, 2023 – 2031 Housing Element, Table D-17.

Local Trends and Analysis

Different types of employment opportunities determine household incomes which in turn determine the types and sizes of housing that households could afford. Table C-9 shows indices on access to opportunity within Santa Barbara County. The indices confirm generally lower levels of opportunities for minority groups. The minority groups most noticeably disadvantaged in terms of access to opportunities are Blacks and Hispanics among the general population and among those below the poverty line. Indices

on transportation cost and environmental health are the two that appear most equitable in the Guadalupe area.

Transit options are relatively limited within the City. The City does not have any “High Quality Transit Stops” or “High Quality Transit Areas within ½ mile”, and only has one bus route (The Guadalupe Flyer). This line has its terminus points at the Santa Maria Transit Center and the Guadalupe Amtrak Station with one additional stop at Obispo/Amber within the City. It runs hourly from approximately 6 am to 7 pm.

Table C-9: HUD Opportunity Indicators in Santa Barbara County, 2010

Race/ Ethnicity	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Trips Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Environmental Health Index
White	67.71	44.75	51.05	63.35	52.17	65.19	74.85
Black	57.64	34.79	40.87	43.22	42.03	66.92	79.12
Hispanic	44.85	25.92	45.81	46.07	49.03	69.59	74.64
Asian or Pacific Islander	64.49	42.89	51.84	55.29	54.07	68.36	73.05
Native American	57.08	38.06	43.52	51.93	43.28	64.97	77.11
Population Below Federal Poverty Level							
White	63.12	44.55	55.02	50.73	62.49	72.97	72.79
Black	43.97	20.49	48.44	41.04	49.14	74.18	77.24
Hispanic	34.61	21.38	46	38.57	50.73	74.38	74.84
Asian or Pacific Islander	66.51	53.99	59.09	48.89	70.28	77.05	70.4
Native American	56.65	36.39	53.05	53.48	47.48	68.4	78.38

Sources: HUD, 2020; County of Santa Barbara, 2023 – 2031 Housing Element, Table D-16.

Table C-10 is a summary from the American Community Survey. It shows that both Guadalupe and Santa Barbara County as a whole reflected relatively similar levels of employment with approximately 95 percent of those residents in the labor force employed in 2020. Similarly, approximately 5 percent of those in the labor force were unemployed. Guadalupe, however, depicted a slight advantage in the unemployment rate. On the surface, employment status would suggest some modicum of fairness. Nevertheless, the types of jobs and remuneration can make major differences in equality of economic opportunity.

Table C-10: Labor Force and Employment Rates - Guadalupe City vs. Santa Barbara County, 2020

	Guadalupe City		Santa Barbara County	
	Persons	Percent	Persons	Percent
EMPLOYMENT STATUS				
In Labor Force*	3,529	68%	227,159	64%
Employed	3,393	96.1%	212,400	93.5%
Unemployed	136	3.9%	12,848	5.7%
Not in Labor Force	1,669	32%	129,540	36%
All ages 16 and over	5,198		356,699	
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT				
Population 25 to 64 years	3,383		208,085	
Less than high school graduate	1,367	40%	41,349	20%
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	616	18%	35,333	17%
Some college or associate degree	1,056	31%	62,513	30%
Bachelor's degree or higher	344	10%	68,890	33%

*Ages 16 and over in labor force

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S2301

Table C-10 also shows comparative educational attainment between Guadalupe and Santa Barbara County. The differences are extreme at the lowest and highest levels of education. In 2020, a notable 40 percent of Guadalupe’s population did not graduate high school compared to half as much (20 percent) in the County. At the opposite end of the spectrum, Guadalupe had a third as much share of those with a bachelor’s degree or higher compared to Santa Barbara County as a whole. This disparity in level of education has major implications for type of employment and earning potential.

Table C-11 shows the distribution of employment by occupation in 2021 and median earnings in 2020. The largest employment sector for Guadalupe residents was agriculture with approximately two out of every five employed residents; this compares with 6 percent in the County. Agriculture together with the natural resource group of occupations constituted the largest sector at 28 percent (compared to 13 percent in the County) followed by sales occupations at 25 percent in the City and 19 percent in the County. The third and fourth largest occupation groups in Guadalupe were service and production occupations, respectively. The four top occupation groups employed 88 percent of Guadalupe residents. What is most notable is that those occupation groups predominantly offered the lower earning potential except for those in sales. Comparatively in the management occupations where Guadalupe had only 12 percent of its employed, the County had 38 percent of employed residents at salaries that are two times as high as similar fields for Guadalupe residents and three times as much as agriculture. With median earning at \$23,171, agriculture provided nearly \$8,000 more in median annual earning than the service occupation group, but it provided \$42,000 lower median earning than the highest-paying sector (Management). Close examination of the distribution suggests that working residents of Guadalupe fall predominantly into occupations that pay low to mid-level salaries that are below \$45,000 a year. Housing affordability would depend on the number of income earners in households and families.

Education and job training are ways to evolve toward opportunities for higher earning ability. However, populations in Guadalupe, particularly, lagged behind in educational attainment. In 2021, for instance, 36 percent of the population in California attained a bachelor’s degree or higher. Closely mirroring the State, 33 percent of residents in Santa Barbara County attained a bachelor’s degree or higher. Notably in Guadalupe, 10 percent of its population attained that level of education. This realization suggests the need for a push to provide resources and educational classes for low-income families in Guadalupe.

Table C-11: Distribution of Employment by Occupation (2021) and Median Earning (2020)

Occupation	Guadalupe City			Santa Barbara County		
	Persons	Percent	Median Earning	Persons	Percent	Median Earning
Civilian employed population 16 years and over	3,400		\$26,646	211,109		\$35,775
Management, business, science, and arts occupations:	407	12%	\$32,288	80,757	38%	\$65,131
Management, business, and financial occupations:	229	7%	\$33,750	32,271	15%	\$74,050
Management occupations	177	5%	\$32,014	23,397	11%	\$79,312
Business and financial operations occupations	52	2%	\$45,795	8,874	4%	\$64,244
Computer, engineering, and science occupations:	28	1%	-	14,346	7%	\$77,442
Computer and mathematical occupations	0	0%	-	6,552	3%	\$86,731
Architecture and engineering occupations	17	1%	-	4,954	2%	\$81,447
Life, physical, and social science occupations	11	0%	-	2,840	1%	\$53,261
Education, legal, community service, arts, and media occupations:	96	3%	\$31,389	24,162	11%	\$40,723
Community and social service occupations	12	0%	-	3,532	2%	\$44,326
Legal occupations	0	0%	-	1,945	1%	\$91,988
Educational instruction, and library occupations	56	2%	\$30,278	14,175	7%	\$33,044
Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media occupations	28	1%	\$67,882	4,510	2%	\$40,709
Healthcare practitioners and technical occupations:	54	2%	\$43,125	9,978	5%	\$74,182
Health diagnosing and treating practitioners and other technical occupations	15	0%	-	6,608	3%	\$87,490
Health technologists and technicians	39	1%	-	3,370	2%	\$41,632
Service occupations:	602	18%	\$15,167	43,154	20%	\$21,769
Healthcare support occupations	194	6%	\$18,450	8,352	4%	\$23,968

Occupation	Guadalupe City			Santa Barbara County		
	Persons	Percent	Median Earning	Persons	Percent	Median Earning
Protective service occupations:	78	2%	\$43,333	3,772	2%	\$60,329
Firefighting and prevention, and other protective service workers including supervisors	60	2%	\$29,167	2,261	1%	\$28,196
Law enforcement workers including supervisors	18	1%	-	1,511	1%	\$81,767
Food preparation and serving related occupations	55	2%	\$14,777	14,008	7%	\$17,195
Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations	234	7%	\$7,165	11,195	5%	\$24,857
Personal care and service occupations	41	1%	\$15,709	5,827	3%	\$20,536
Sales and office occupations:	859	25%	\$41,622	39,562	19%	\$32,802
Sales and related occupations	387	11%	\$23,750	18,604	9%	\$27,267
Office and administrative support occupations	472	14%	\$52,237	20,958	10%	\$35,508
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations:	938	28%	\$26,037	28,050	13%	\$29,396
Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations	646	19%	\$23,171	13,101	6%	\$23,950
Construction and extraction occupations	163	5%	\$32,027	10,511	5%	\$40,214
Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations	129	4%	\$36,023	4,438	2%	\$41,277
Production, transportation, and material moving occupations:	594	17%	\$26,743	19,586	9%	\$29,563
Production occupations	152	4%	\$26,902	7,365	3%	\$35,135
Transportation occupations	119	4%	\$30,865	5,870	3%	\$31,601
Material moving occupations	323	10%	\$25,898	6,351	3%	\$23,797

Sources: U.S Census Bureau, 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S2401 (Occupations); U.S Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B24011

Trends and Patterns

Guadalupe’s location within reach of labor markets to the north and south in addition to its agriculture and production opportunities have enable it to maintain the trend of relatively low unemployment over time. Lower than typical educational attainment, minimal opportunities to improve skills in the City through education and training, and the necessity to work long hours to make reasonable income spell confinement to lower income jobs for residents of Guadalupe.

Other Relevant Factors

The situation in Guadalupe would more often than not lead to lower ability to earn higher incomes and the perpetuation of the need for affordable housing for the lower-income groups.

Conclusion

Many households in the City within the lower income categories would continue to need affordable housing. The relatively homogeneous ethnic composition in Guadalupe all but eliminates the issue of disparities in opportunities by racial enclaves but can emphasize such a phenomenon in terms of ethnicity.

7.3.2.4 Disproportionate housing needs with displacement risk

Residential displacement may be defined as “the process by which a household is forced to move from its residence or is prevented from moving into a neighborhood that was previously accessible to them because of conditions beyond their control” (UC Berkley Urban Displacement Project). Factors that can trigger residential displacement include redevelopment of previously affordable areas to higher cost units and general increase in housing costs.

The Urban Displacement Project’s (UDP) Estimated Displacement Risk (EDR) model for California identifies varying levels of displacement risk for low-income renter households in all census tracts in the state from 2015 to 2019. The EDR uses machine learning and household level data to predict displacement. To create the EDR, UDP joined data from the following multiple sources:

- Household-level data from Data Axle (formerly Infogroup);
- Tract-level data from the 2014 and 2019 5-year American Community Survey;
- Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) data from various sources compiled by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD);
- Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (LODES) data; and
- The Environmental Protection Agency’s Smart Location Database.

UDP uses a machine learning model to determine the variables that most strongly relate to displacement at the household level. Then it uses model parameters to predict tract-level displacement risk statewide while controlling for the region. UDP models displacement risk as the net migration rate of three separate income categories of renter households:

1. Extremely low-income (ELI), which are households with incomes from 0% to 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI);
2. Very low-income (VLI), which are households with incomes from 30% to 50% of AMI; and
3. Low-income (LI), which are households with incomes from 50% to 80% of AMI.

The model classifies census tracts with predicted net losses within these groups as experiencing any of three levels of displacement labeled as elevated, high, or extreme. The output also includes a category, termed “At Risk of Displacement”, in tracts that might be experiencing displacement.

Regional Trends and Comparisons

Figure C-21 shows estimated levels of displacement risk in Guadalupe and its region. While the full range of displacement risks exist in the larger cities of San Luis Obispo to the north, Santa Maria to the east, and Lompoc to the south, there are noticeable pockets of areas across the region that have the classification, “at risk of displacement”. This means the model estimates potential displacement or risk of displacement of the given population in the tracts with this classification.

Local Trends and Analysis

According to Figure C-21, the City of Guadalupe notably has the classification of “1 income group displacement”. This means one of the income groups in the census tract is likely to experience

displacement risk. Consequently, some of the neighborhoods could have small pockets of displacement within their boundaries.

Figure C-21: Levels of Displacement Risk in Guadalupe & Region, 2019



Sources: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022.

There are no development proposals in the Guadalupe General Plan and its housing section that would cause disproportionate housing needs within the jurisdiction or create the risk of displacing segments of the population. On the contrary, development proposals promote a variety of type and cost of housing in the form of mixed-use, ADU, and medium-income housing. The exception to this observation is difficulty in producing sufficient variety of housing to meet the allocation within every affordability group. The RHNA process determines the allocation within affordability groups at the regional level while considering the needs of the City and the larger region within which Guadalupe resides.

Trends and Patterns

Figure C-22 compares trends over the previous decade in vacancy rates within Guadalupe and Santa Barbara County. Guadalupe has hovered close to and sometimes dipped below the 5 percent vacancy rate commonly adjudged healthy for communities. The County has also maintained relatively low vacancy rates consistently at 7 percent of the housing stock. The relatively tight housing market within and outside Guadalupe in terms of available units is a condition that can trigger competitive bidding and ultimately displacement risk especially for those in the lower income brackets.


Review of the previous housing elements reveals that Guadalupe has a progressively good record of accomplishment in meeting its allocated housing needs and most consistently in taking care of the need in the lower income groups. The following paragraphs illustrate.

The 2009-to-2014 RHNA cycle straddled a period of weak recovery from the economic recession period, which began in December 2007 as a result of a crisis that subprime mortgages and the resulting housing bubble in previous years induced. The housing market correction that followed busted the housing bubble and the United States entered a severe economic recession. Although a recovery began in 2009, it was weak resulting in an erratic, slow, and uneven growth in jobs and Gross Domestic Product (GDP) through 2015. As a result, construction of new housing units halted in the City of Guadalupe during that housing cycle. The City saw the production of 3 new housing units in the above moderate-income category.

During Guadalupe's 5th Cycle (2015 to 2023), the DJ Farms Specific Plan area broke ground in 2015, built and sold 130 new housing units by January 2019 and a total of 363 by the end of 2022. The units fell primarily in the moderate and above moderate-income categories. By the end of the cycle, the City fulfilled more than its share of RHNA allocations of 50 units for the planning period in all the income categories. Appendix A has additional details.

The City of Guadalupe adopted its 5th Cycle Housing Element on May 24, 2016 and submitted it to HCD for review on June 9, 2016. While HCD found the adopted housing element to be in full compliance with State housing element law (GC, Article 10.6), it was nevertheless late and triggered the requirement [Senate Bill 375, (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008), amended GC Section 65588(e)(4)] to revise its element every four years until adopting at least two consecutive revisions by the applicable due dates. Therefore, the due date for the City to revise its subsequent housing element was February 15, 2019.

Figure C-22: 2010 to 2021 Trends in Housing Vacancy in Guadalupe and Santa Barbara County



Sources: U.S Census Bureau, 2010, 2015, 2019, 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25002

During the period of the 2019 to 2027 Housing Element, Guadalupe recorded the construction of 270 additional units mainly in the moderate and above moderate-income brackets. Table C-12 summarizes progress in achieving quantified objectives under the 5th Cycle. The City exceeded housing production in both the lower income and moderate-income categories. It is most notable that the pressure on demand for housing in the region also enabled the production of twelve times as many above moderate units as allocated under the 5th Cycle.

Table C-12. Progress in Achieving Quantified Objectives (All Incomes) in 2015-2023 Housing Element

Income Category	Quantified Objective	Completed Progress				Future
	(Allocated 5th Cycle Dwelling Units)	(Completed 2015 to 2019)	(Completed 2019 to 2022)	Total Completed in 5th Cycle	Percent of 5th Cycle RHNA Completed	(Dwelling Units Pending Construction)
	RHNA Allocation	New Construction				
Extremely low	5	2	4	6	120%	0
Very Low	7	1	26	27	386%	0
Low	8	1	7	8	100%	0
Moderate	13	23	131	154	1185%	40
Above Moderate	17	107	102	209	1229%	284
Total	50	134	270	404	808%	320

00 – Accessory Dwelling Units

00 – People’s Self-Help Housing Project

00 – Pasadera Housing Development

DJ Farms Specific Plan broke ground in 2015, built and sold 130 new housing units by January 2019.	
DJ Farms built 363 dwelling units by end of 2022 (Guadalupe Building Department).	
DJ Farms had authorization to construct a total of 740 dwelling units as of the end of 2022.	
DJ Farms had a difference of 377 units to construct as of the end of 2022	

Sources: City of Guadalupe Planning Department; SBCAG, 2014-2022 RHNA Allocations.

Other Relevant Factors

Closely related to the risk of displacement are the price and availability of the housing stock. The housing vacancy rate depicts the availability, which reflects the relationship between housing supply and demand. For example, if the demand for housing is greater than the available supply, then the vacancy rate would be very low, and the price of housing would most likely increase. A low overall vacancy rate that indicates high demand and short supply of housing may result in overcrowding and ultimately unsafe, unsanitary, or otherwise unsuitable accommodations. When low vacancy results in high prices of homes and rentals, the effect is most severe on lower income households, people on fixed incomes, families with children, and other special-need groups. Housing discrimination could occur when the rental vacancy rate is low. And the risk of displacement could increase most notably to lower income households.

The vacancy rate also indicates whether a community has an adequate housing supply to provide choice and mobility. The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) indicates that a vacancy rate of 5 percent is enough to provide choice and mobility. The vacancy rate in Guadalupe over the previous decade ranged from 3 percent during an economic boom to 6 percent in 2010 in the aftermath

of the housing market crash of the mid-2000s. The data reveal that the City has been typically near the recommended vacancy rate of 5 percent, which would indicate that Guadalupe residents have somewhat of a limited housing choice and mobility and could be susceptible to displacement risks that low vacancy rates could trigger. Small numbers of homeless populations are known to exist in the City.

Conclusion

While there are no development proposals in the General Plan and its housing section that would cause disproportionate housing needs within the jurisdiction or create the risk of displacing segments of the population, the City has been typically close to the recommended vacancy rate of 5 percent, which would indicate that Guadalupe residents have somewhat of a limited housing choice and mobility and could be susceptible to the displacement risks that low vacancy rates could trigger. While such risks may be greater for households in the lower-income segments from price competition, the City has steadfastly kept the production of lower-income housing at par with its allocations over the previous two cycles. And the incidence of homelessness is rare in the City.

7.3.3 Sites Inventory

Appendix B has details on residential land inventory. Preparation of the Guadalupe General Plan included a complete land use inventory in 2017, which identified specific sites that were suitable for residential development. The site inventory and analysis helped in determining whether program actions are necessary to designate sites with appropriate zoning, development standards, and infrastructure capacity to accommodate the RHNA-allocated units. Using the inventory of available land, the analysis proceeded to determine (a) the suitability of individual parcels and (b) the appropriate development densities. For the 2023 to 2031 planning horizon, the Santa Barbara County Council of Governments approved the Regional Housing Needs Allocations (RHNA) and assigned a total of 431 new housing units to Guadalupe.

7.3.3.1 Location and Affordability of Sites

The 6th-Cycle, 2023 to 2031 Housing Element, narrowed its focus on the location and affordability of new housing development onto the historically compact city limits as the most accessible and most location-efficient area for relatively short-term housing development. Table B-4 in Appendix B is an inventory showing vacant parcels with residential development opportunities in the downtown area. Parcels that are vacant and designated for housing development can accommodate housing units for households with incomes that are below moderate and moderate.

For mixed-use development, the Housing Element designates mixed-use development at such strategic locations as the City's historic downtown. This offers additional housing opportunities for a range of income groups, including those for lower income residents. The General Plan identified 2.7 acres of vacant land downtown to accommodate mixed-use (housing and commercial) development for low, very low, and moderate-income housing. Anticipated to be high density residential units, housing in the

mixed-use development can accommodate 35 additional housing units. Figure B-2 of Appendix B identifies parcels designated for mixed-use development.

For accessory dwelling units, residential lots with potential to comfortably develop affordable accessory dwelling units (ADU) have the potential to generate 120 such units across 40 acres of single-family homes mostly east of Downtown and in the Gularte Tract. Table B-6 of Appendix B is an inventory of those lots while Figure B-2 of Appendix B identifies parcels with ADU potential.

For moderate and above moderate housing, the Pasadera development has the capacity to accommodate those types of units. Additionally, the General Plan has identified capacity across the City to accommodate a total of 639 dwelling units of various densities and price points.

The analysis points to the conclusion that the number of units possible in the downtown area, the location of sites, and the affordability of units to build can accommodate lower, moderate, and above moderate income RHNA allocations and result in a favorable assessment of fair housing in Guadalupe. The sites would not raise issues with integration and segregation within the City nor would they foster racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty due to the City's predominant Hispanic ethnicity. Rather than reduce areas of opportunity, the sites hold the promise of expanding convenience of access and filling gaps in any disproportionate housing needs of the past including the risk of displacements for lower income households.

7.3.3.2 Improvement or Exacerbation of Conditions by Sites

The concentration of new housing within the city limits of Guadalupe and the diversity of housing types proposed in the area are to assure location efficiency in terms of development cost since utilities are already present or within short extensions to the units to be developed. The cost of land would be minimal, if any, for mixed-use and ADUs which together with other location advantages can deliver affordable units of different sizes. Public transit already serves the City and is proposed under the Circulation Element of the General Plan to be routed through the City for increased accessibility to this transportation alternative. The increase in intensity of development together with the mixture of residential and commercial uses in the City would facilitate the use of non-motorized modes thereby reducing living costs for residents and indirectly expanding the abilities of those at the margins to afford housing in higher price ranges if they so choose.


The analysis points to the conclusion that instead of exacerbating conditions for each of the fair housing areas, the concentration of housing under the 6th Cycle within City limits, can enhance the affordability of units to build, accommodate lower, moderate, and above moderate income RHNA allocations, and result in a favorable assessment of fair housing in Guadalupe. The compactness of the City would not raise issues with integration and segregation within the City nor would it foster racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty. Rather than reduce areas of opportunity, the compactness holds the promise of expanding convenience of access and filling gaps in any disproportionate housing needs of the past including the risk of displacements for lower income households.

7.3.4 Identification of Contributing Factors

Among the factors that could contribute to high cost, environmental risk, and environmental justice concerns in relation to fair housing issues in a community are: (a) the presence of hazardous waste and (b) toxic release. For the City of Guadalupe, however, all indications are that these two factors are not major issues although much of the new housing is to go into a largely built-up area. There are, therefore, no other known contributing factors to fair housing in Guadalupe.

According to data from the Cal Enviro Screen site, Guadalupe had little *hazardous waste* in its central city area. Similarly, data from the Cal Enviro Screen site via the HCD AFFH Data Viewer indicate that the City had minimal *toxic release* in its City limits. Figure C-22 depicts the incidence of toxic release within Guadalupe. Compared to the State average, Guadalupe fell in the lowest category.

Figure C-23: 2022 Incidence of Toxic Release by Census Tract in Guadalupe



Sources: State HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2022

7.3.5 Goals and Actions

Goal 6 of the 6th Cycle Housing Element and associated policies and programs consolidate actions toward affirmatively furthering **Fair Housing**. **Table 6-3** combines the relevant policy statements and initiatives that are not explicitly listed among the housing-specific policies of the Housing Element (sections 6.1 through 6.6). It is noteworthy that the additional fair housing actions (which are not housing-specific) do support the goal of affirmatively furthering fair housing. Refer to Table 6-3 for the comprehensive list of AFFH programs.

7.3.6 Local Data and Knowledge

In addition to information presented in the analysis of fair housing above, additional local data and knowledge is helpful to fully analyze potential impediments to fair housing. The following paragraphs summarize local knowledge in the City:

The City comprises primarily residential neighborhoods, with minimal commercial opportunities. However, the City is focusing its economic development strategy to include new commercial opportunities as the City continues to grow to provide residents with commercial and recreational opportunities in their own City. For example, the City recently amended the Land Use Element to change downtown from General-Commercial to Mixed-Use. This will allow many more commercial opportunities together with second-floor housing downtown. Also, south of Highway 166 and adjacent to Highway 1 are parcels for neighborhood commercial development as part of the Pasadera neighborhood. Discussions are under way to locate a large grocery store north of Highway 166, opposite neighborhood commercial parcels of Pasadera.

There are no areas within the City with a concentration of persons with disabilities, group homes or residential care facilities, or locational differences in terms of disabilities. Ongoing programs of the Public Works Department, include such accessibility improvements for sidewalks as handicap ramps.

The incidence of children in female-headed households with no spouse present occur throughout the City. Existing social programs of Santa Barbara County cater to those identified as in need for support.

Subsidized housing exists in the northeastern part of town (e.g., Escalante Meadows) and the agricultural worker apartment complex called Guadalupe Court in the east, as well as in the far western end of town north of Highway 166, within the 30-year deed-restricted apartment development called Riverview Apartments. It is notable that these subsidized housing units are part of newer developments and thus include newer housing stock.

Major industries in and around the City are centered around agriculture, with 29% of residents in the labor force employed in this sector. In 2020, the largest employment sector for Guadalupe residents was farming, fishing, and forestry with approximately one out of every three employed residents.

As part of the new and ongoing growth area in Pasadera, anticipated infrastructure improvements are part and package of additional development. These improvements were negotiated as part of the Specific Plan adoption process.

Given the City's size, there is regular transit to Santa Maria, which provides opportunities to access other centers in the region, including the large employment centers in Santa Maria and San Luis Obispo County.

Home prices in the southern portion of the City, where the newer housing stock is concentrated, tend to be higher than those in the other portions of the City.

Outside of agricultural land constraints (Williamson Act) and 100-year floodplain that exists north and west of city boundaries, there is also the wetland complex near the Gularte Tract. The General Plan accounted for these constraints in the Land Use Element. Therefore no additional environmental constraints exist to residential development.

7.4 Appendix D: Development Fees

This appendix presents a consolidated list of fees, which combines common planning department fees with a master schedule of development fees in Guadalupe. City Council Resolution No. 2013-39 of September 24, 2013 adopted the Master Fee Schedule, which was recently re-established by ordinance. Requested services not covered by the Master Fee Schedule are to be charged actual costs at full cost recovery and might require a deposit. Where:

Full cost recovery = actual cost + 30% Administrative Overhead

The following link provides a web link to an exhaustive list of fees including personnel rates for actual costs: <https://ci.guadalupe.ca.us/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Master-Fee-Schedule-FY-2020-2021-Attachment-2-8-11-2020.pdf>

Table D-1: Consolidated List of Fees in Guadalupe

[Table C-1]	Activity or Service	Fee Type (Fixed or Deposit toward Actual Cost)	Fee
	Annexation	Deposit	\$12,500
	Building Permit		Fee required by CBC
	Certification of Compliance	Deposit	\$750
	City Council Conceptual Review	Fixed Fee	\$750
	Coastal Development Permit	Deposit	\$1,000
	CUP/DPR - home occupation permit	Fixed Fee	\$250
	CUP/DPR - major	Deposit	\$3,500
	CUP/DPR - minor	Deposit	\$1,500
	Development Agreement	Deposit	\$10,000
	EIR Addendum	Deposit	\$7,500
	EIR or Supplemental EIR	Deposit	\$25,000
	Encroachment Permit		\$63
	Environmental Clearance Review - Major) by determination of planner	Deposit	\$1,000
	Environmental Clearance Review - Minor) by determination of planner	Deposit	\$500
	Final Map	Deposit	\$7,400
	General Plan Amendment - major) by determination of planner	Deposit	\$8,000
	General Plan Amendment - minor) by determination of planner	Deposit	\$4,000
	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change	Deposit	\$10,000
	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change	Deposit	\$15,000
	Grading Permit		Fee required by CBC
	Landscape Plan Check - major) by determination of planner	Deposit	\$800
	Landscape Plan Check - minor) by determination of planner	Deposit	\$400
	Lot Line Adjustment	Deposit	\$1,500
	Lot Merger	Deposit	\$750
	Mitigation Monitoring	Deposit	\$1,250
	Negative Declaration - Complex (Mitigated Negative Declaration)	Deposit	\$3,500

[Table C-1] Activity or Service	Fee Type (Fixed or Deposit toward Actual Cost)	Fee
Negative Declaration - Simple	Deposit	\$1,500
Planned Development - minor	Fixed Fee	\$330
Planned Development - major	Deposit	\$2,500
Pre-Application Review - major	Deposit	\$2,500
Pre-Application Review - minor	Fixed Fee	\$330
Preliminary Parcel Map	Deposit	\$1,000
Preliminary Track Map	Deposit	\$2,000
Public Facility and Traffic Impact Fees (per annexation lot)	Fixed Fee	\$800
Public Facility and Traffic Impact Fees (per subdivision lot)	Fixed Fee	\$300
Public Improvement Plan Checking (per single lot)	Fixed Fee	\$290
Public Improvement Plan Checking (per subdivision)	Fixed Fee	\$1,460
Sewer connection fee (per multi-family unit)	Fixed Fee	\$2,361
Sewer connection fee (per single family unit)	Fixed Fee	\$3,542
Sign Permit - major (requiring council approval)	Deposit	\$600
Sign Permit - minor (requiring council approval)	Fixed Fee	\$110
Specific Plan - New	Deposit	\$8,000
Specific Plan - Revision or Amendment	Deposit	\$4,000
Sphere of Influence Adjustment	Deposit	\$5,000
Temporary Use Permit	Deposit	\$500
Tentative Parcel Map	Deposit	\$3,000
Tentative Tract Map	Deposit	\$5,000
Time Extension or Appeal	Fixed Fee	\$570
Variance	Deposit	\$1,500
Water Connection Fee (based on the diameter of the service line)	Fixed Fee	
Zoning Clearance - change in use only	Fixed Fee	\$150
Zoning Clearance - home business application	Fixed Fee	\$150
Zoning Clearance - multi-family development or commercial	Fixed Fee	\$400
Zoning Clearance - new single-family unit or duplex	Fixed Fee	\$250
Zoning code Change - major	Deposit	\$5,000
Zoning code Change - minor	Deposit	\$7,500
Zoning Code Text Amendment	Deposit	\$2,500

8.0 References

- California Department of Housing and Community Development. (2022). AFFH Data Viewer
- City of Guadalupe. (2019). 2019-2027 Housing Element
- City of Guadalupe. (2016). 2015-2027 Housing Element
- City of Guadalupe. (2014). Zoning Code
- City of Guadalupe. (2013). Master Schedule of Fees
- City of Guadalupe. (2006). DJ Farms Revised Specific Plan EIR
- City of Guadalupe. (2014). Wastewater System and Treatment Master Plan
- City of Guadalupe. (2017). Background Report: Land Use Inventory
- City of Guadalupe. (2022). Guadalupe 2042 General Plan
- Pasadera Homes. (n.d.). DJ Farms Development web site: <https://newpasaderahomes.com/pasadera-site-map>
- Santa Barbara County Association of Governments. (2023). Regional Housing needs Allocation for 2023-2031
- Santa Barbara County Association of Governments. (2013). Regional Housing needs Allocation for 2014-2022
- Santa Barbara County. (2023). 2023 – 2031 Housing Element,
- Santa Barbara County. (2016, 2017). Agricultural Production Report: <https://countyofsb.org/uploadedFiles/agcomm/Content/Other/crops/2017.pdf>
- State of California Employment Development Department. (2017). Protected Job Growth by Occupation from 2014 to 2024 in the Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Goleta Metropolitan Statistical Area
- State of California, Governor’s Office of Planning Research (OPR). (2019, 2003). General Plan Guidelines. Sacramento, CA. www.opr.ca.gov/
- United States Census Bureau. (2015). On-The-Map Tool of the Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics
- United States Census Bureau. (2006-2010, 2011-2015, 2016-2020). American Community Survey. 5-Year Estimates. Table 2301; Table B11016; Table B17013; Table B19013; Table B24011; Table B25007; Table B25009; Table B25014; Table B25020; Table B25031; Table B25056; Table B25058; Table B25074; Table B25095; Table B25109; Table DP03; Table DP03; Table DP04; Table DP-4; Table H1; Table H2; Table HCT012; Table S0101; Table S1810; Table S1901; Table S2401; Table S2501
- United States Census Bureau. (1990, 2000, 2020). Decennial Census. SF3 Table PF1
- United States Census of Agriculture. (2012). Census Volume 1 Chapter 2. County Level Data. Table 7
- Victoria Transport Policy Institute. (2008). Transportation Demand Management. <http://www.vtpi.org!tdm!tdm4S.htm>